CONSIDERATIONS
ON THE
COVNCIL
Ben. Arg. OF Prov. Cant.
TRENT:
BEING
The Fifth Diſcourſe,
CONCERNING
The *GVIDE* in *CONTROVERSIES*

By *R. H.*

1 Pet. 3. 15.---*Parati ſemper ad ſatisfactionem omni poſcenti vos Rationem.*
2 Cor. 6. 8.----*Per infamiam, & bonam famam; Ut ſeductores, & Veraces.*

Printed in the Year, MDCLXXI.

J. Hudson.

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE

COUNCIL

OF TRENT:

The Fifth Discourse

The Preface.

IN the former *Diſcourſes* concerning the *Guide in Controverſies*, as alſo, in the Beginning and Concluſion of this preſent, I have endeavoured to perſwade a neceſſity of *Obedience* to a lawful *Church-Authority* from theſe weighty Conſiderations, whereon ſeem to be built the *Unity*, and the *Peace* of *Chriſtian* Religion. 1. Firſt, That, However the *Holy Scriptures* are a Rule *ſufficient*; yet not, in reſpect of all capacities, a Rule ſo *clear*, but that the *true ſenſe* of them is by ſeveral Parties much diſputed; and that in points of Faith *neceſſary* to be known; And therefore, as to theſe, need of ſome other Guide for the direction of Chriſtians in this true Senſe. 2. That there is contained in theſe Scriptures a Divine *Promiſe*, and that not Conditional, but *Abſolute*, of *Indefectibility*, or not erring in Neceſſaries, made to the *Church-Catholick* of all Ages: To It, not only *Diffuſive*, (ſome or other, Perſons, or Churches, alwaies not to erre in neceſſaries;) but, as a *Guide*; or, to the Guides thereof. 3. Again; That the *Catholick Church* throughout the whole World is but *One*, ever contradiſtinct to all other Communions *Heretical*, or *Schiſmatical*: And, its *Governours* and Clergy, however diſperſed through ſeveral Nations, regulated by the ſame *Laws*; and ſtraitly linked together in a due *ſubordination*; whereby the *Inferiors* are ſubjected to the *Superiors*, and a *Part* to the *Whole*, in ſuch manner; as that theſe Laws, obſerved, admit of, or conſiſt with, no *Schiſms*, Diviſions, or contradicting Parties, after any paſt *Declaration* of the Church. 4. That, in this Subordination, no *inferior*

Clergy (*Perſon, Church*, or *Council*,) when ſtanding in any oppoſition to their *Superiors*, can be this *Guide* to Chriſtians: But only the Superior, whether Perſon, or Council: and, in a *Council* not wholy unanimous, the *major Part*, join'd with the *See Apoſtolick*. *The major part*; whether thoſe *preſent* in the Council, and decreeing matters in debate, or thoſe *abſent*, and accepting their Decrees: A regular obedience, in any contradiction, thus aſcending to, and acquieſcing in, the *ſentence* of the moſt *ſupreme* in preſent actual being. That alſo, theſe *ſubordinations* of *Church-Governours* are ſo commonly known; and by the learned on all ſides acknowledged, that even a *Plebeian*, following this line, though amidſt ſo many *Sects* calling him hither, and thither, and all offering to ſhew him the right way, cannot miſtake his true *Guide*. That, from this *preſent Guide* thus diſcovered, All are to learn, both as to the true *ſenſe* of *Holy Scriptures*; and, of *Antiquity*, or former *Church-Tradition*, and alſo the *legalneſs* of former *Councils*, &c. (when any of theſe are controverted and queſtioned,) the *Reſolution* of that, which they ought to believe, and adhere to, ſo far as its *Determinations* have preſcribed to their *Faith*. And, the more important any point is, that they are hence the more ſtrictly obliged to the Declarations of this Authority, becauſe here more danger in their miſtake. That here; if we grant an *Infallibility* of this Guide in *Neceſſaries* (which is amply proved) this bindeth its Subjects to an *univerſal* acceptance of its *Decrees*, leſt, perhaps in ſome *Neceſſary*, their Faith ſhould miſcarry. Or, this Guide ſuppoſed *Fallible*, (which preſuppoſeth in ſuch matters ſome obſcurity in the *Rule*) yet neither thus, are the bonds of their *obedience* any way relaxed, ſince their own fallibility is much greater: And if, in following ſuch a learned and prudent Conduct, they are expoſed to ſome *error*, yet ſo, to much more, and more groſs, by following their own. Of the miſchief of which *Self-conduct* the many mo-

dern,

dern, moſt abſurd *Sects*, and eſpecially the *Socinians*, are a dreadful Example. Who very inquiſitive, and laborious, and critical, as to the *Holy Scriptures*, yet, by throwing off the yoke of a legal *Church-Authority*, are, by the Divine juſt judgment, delivered up to moſt *Capital*, and *Deſperate* errors, and thoſe running through the whole Body of *Divinity*. 6 That none, in the reſiſtance of *Authority*, can be ſecured by following his *Conſcience*; (though alwaies obliged to follow it,) when It, *culpably*, miſguiding him; and in the information whereof he hath not uſed neceſſary diligence. 7 That, where ſuch a weighty *Church-Authority* (I ſpeak of the moſt *ſupreme*, to which the Churches Subjects may apply themſelves) ſo highly authorized, and recommended to us by our *Lord*, ſways on the one ſide, and only *Arguments* and *Reaſons*, relating to the matter in Agitation, but all theſe ſhort of *certainty*, on the other, here a ſober and diſintereſſed Judgment cannot but paſs ſentence; that it is ſafer to ſubmit to the *firſt* of theſe, than relie on the *ſecond*. And then; ſo often, the following our *reaſons* and private opinion, and deſerting *Authority*, becomes acting againſt our *Judgment* and *Conſcience*, and the forſaking our private Reaſon, acting according to it. 8 That thus; at leaſt, all thoſe, who have a contrary perſwaſion to Authority, but *ſhort* of *certainty*; (*i. e.* all *illiterat*, and plebeians, unable to examine Controverſies; or alſo *learned*, that after examining them, are left ſtill in ſome doubt, which two ſorts will comprehend the moſt Chriſtians) are engaged, in *Conſcience*, to yield their *aſſent* to the *Deciſions* of this Authority. 9 That an *abſolute* and *Demonſtrative* Certainty indeed, where-ever it is, is exempted from all ſuch obedience to Authority, as ſhall require ſubmiſſion of *Judgment*, and *Aſſent*: But, that ſuch a *Certainty* is very difficultly attained, in matters *Intellectual*, and abſtracted from ſenſe; more difficultly yet, in thoſe *Spiritual*, and *Divine*; eſpecially, ſuch Divine and Spiritual-

rituall matters, where *Church Authority*, *i. e.* ſo numerous a Body of *learned* and *prudent* men, diſcern little reaſon for that we pretend Certainty of, and ſo much againſt it, as that they declare the *contrary* for *certain*. To which may be added the frequent experience of our own weakneſs, when, by more ſtudy, and better weighting, and comparing *contrary* Reaſons, we come to *doubt* of the truth of ſeveral things, wherein, formerly, we thought our ſelves moſt fully ſatisfied. 10 That, ſuppoſing ſuch a *Certainty* attained; and ſo obedience of *Aſſent* juſtly repealed; yet, if this be of a *Truth* of no *great importance* or conſequence (of which *great* importance too, as well as of the truth it ſelf, they are to be *certain*,) here ſtill, another *Obedience*, *viz.* that of *ſilence*, or Non-contradiction, tyes us faſt, and reſts ſtill due, and payable to *Church-Authority*: And ſo, theſe *Certainiſts*, or *Demonſtrators*, become, at leaſt, tongue-tied, and conſtrained to ſtand *ſingle*; and diſinabled to father, or beget, *Sects*. 11 Or, in the laſt place, if this alſo Certain, that it is a *Truth* of *great* concernment, and the *Error* of the Church-Guides therein not only manifeſt, but *Intolerable*, and ſo they here obliged alſo, to break this ſecond obedience, ſilence, and to publiſh ſuch truth: Yet remain they ſtill fettered with the Bonds of a third *Obedience*; I mean *Paſſive*, in a meek ſubmittance to the *Church's Cenſures*. And, if they ſhall happen to be *excommunicated* by the *Church*, and externally diſjoyned from its Society, yet is it by no means lawful for them, after their publiſhing *new Doctrines*, to proceed alſo to erect a *new Altar*, or Anti-Communion, againſt it: But, patiently undergoing its ſentence, and longing for their peaceable reſtorement to the former *Catholick* Communion (which is alwaies but *One*, and may not be divided,) they are to expect, from God, the vindication, of his *Truth*; and their *Innocence*: Which ſo long as any ſuffers for, he remains ſtill *internally* a member of this former *Society*, from which

which *externally* he is excluded. Now by this third *Obedience*, if the Churches *Faith* in ſome manner ſuffers, yet its *Unity* at leaſt will remain unviolated, and not divided, or torn, by Schiſmes. Theſe things I have endeavoured to repreſent, and perſwade to the pious Reader in the former *Diſcourſes*; as alſo, in the beginning and concluſion of this preſent Work, have further preſſed them. Now, from ſuch a ſubmiſſion to a *legal* Church-Authority once gained, the ſame is rightly demanded to that of *Trent*, if this *Council* proved *Legal*: And then, by this Council, once received and ſubmitted to, is an end put to the moſt, and chieſeſt, of the *modern* Theological *Controverſies*, and preſent Church-diſtractions. This, then, is the Task of the following Diſcourſe: Of which I implore the *Divine Majeſty* for a *proſperous* ſucceſs, only ſo far, as it maintains a *right*, and juſt, Cauſe; and ſo commit the *Reader* to the gracious Illuminations of his *Holy Spirit*.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Proteſtant-Objections againſt this Council.

OBjected *by Proteſtants,*

1. *That the Council of* Trent *was not a General Council,* §. 3.
2. *That, not Patriarchal,* §. 4.
3. *That, not Free and Legal, in its Proceedings,* §. 5.
4. *That, Several of its Deciſions are without, or contrary to, Scripture, to Primitive Tradition; and Tyrannically Impoſed,* §. 6.
5. *That the Decrees of this Council touching Reformation were meerly Deluſory,* §. 6. n. 2.

A method of Conſiderations ſet down §. 7. 8.

CHAP. II.

Some General Conſiderations pre-poſed.

1. *Of Inferior Councils.*

The due Subordination, and other Regulations, of them, §. 9.

1. *The ſeveral Councils, at leaſt ſo high as the Patriarchal, to be called, and moderated, by their reſpective Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, or Preſidents; and nothing to be paſſed by them, without his; or by Him without their, conſent,* §. 10.
2. *No Introduction, or Ordination, of Inferior Clergy to be made without Approbation, or Confirmation of the Superior,* §. 11.
3. *Differences between Inferiors, upon Appeal, to be decided by Superiors; and thoſe of higher perſons, and in greater Cauſes, by the Biſhop of the firſt See.* §. 12. (*where, concerning his conteſt, about this, with the* Africans. §. 13. n. 2.)

Yet; that no perſons, or Synods, co-ordinate might uſurp authority, one over another: Not all Cauſes aſcend to the Higheſt Courts; and, many, without troubling the Synod, in its Interval, to be decided by its Preſident, §. 14.

4. Obedience, in any diſſent happening amongſt Superiors, to be yielded to the Superior of them.
The Confeſſions of Learned Proteſtants, touching the Precedents, §. 16.
5. No Addreſſes, or Appeals, permitted, from the Superior Eccleſiaſtical, to any ſecular Judge, or Court, §. 20.
Where, That the Church, from the beginning, was conſtituted a diſtinct Body from the Civil State, §. 21.
And, what ſeem to be her Rights and Priviledges, (as ſo diſtinct.) §. 22.

CHAP. III.

2. *Of Councils General.*

1. The neceſſary Compoſition of them, conſidered with relation to the Acceptation of them by Abſents, §. 35.
This Acceptation in what meaſure requiſite, §. 39.
2. To whom belongs the Preſidentſhip in theſe Councils, §. 45.
3. And Calling of them, §. 47.

CHAP. IV.

I. Head. *Of the Generality, and juſt Authority of the Council of Trent.*

1. That the Weſtern Churches, and particularly, that of England, are not freed from the ſubjection to this Council, though it were not General; if, Patriarchal, §. 53.
2. Or, if only ſo General, as thoſe times were capable of, §. 65.
3. That it is not hindred from being General, by reaſon of the abſence of the Greek Churches, §. 66.
4. Nor by reaſon of the abſence of the Proteſtant-Clergy. §. 67.

CHAP. V.

5. That this Council is not hindred from being General, by the abſence of the Roman Catholick Biſhops of ſome Province, or Nation, §. 69.
Where,
1. Of the reaſon of the Paucity of Biſhops in ſome Seſſions §. 70.
2. Of the Ratification of the acts of thoſe Seſſions by the fuller Council under Pius, §. 75.

3. Of the Acceptation of the whole Council by the abſent Prelacy, §. 77. And particularly: Concerning the Acceptation thereof by the French Church. Ib.

CHAP. VI.

6. That the Generality of this Council is not prejudiced, by its being called by the Pope, §. 80.

7. Nor by reaſon of,

1. The pretended Non-generality of the Summons, §. 82.

2. Or, Non-freedom of the Place, §. 83.

3. Or, the want of Safe-Conduct, §. 92.

Where concerning the Doctrine imputed to the Roman Church, That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, §. 93. And of the practice of the Council of Conſtance. §. 101.

CHAP. VII.

8. That this Council is not rendred illegal, by the Oath of Biſhops taken to the Pope, §. 105.

9. Nor yet by the Biſhop's, or Pope's, being a Party, and Judges in their own Cauſe §. 113.

1. Not by the Biſhops their being Judges, Ib.

Where,

Of ſeveral waies of judging Eccleſiaſtical Controverſies, juſtly rejected §. 118.

2. Nor, by the Pope's being Judge. §. 122.

CHAP. VIII.

II Head. *The Invalidity of ſuch a Council, as Proteſtants demanded.*

The Proteſtant-Demands, §. 127.

The unreaſonablneſs of theſe Demands, § 132.

Where,

Of the fruitleſneſs of many Diets (framed according to Proteſtant-Propoſals) to decide their Controverſies.

CHAP. IX.

III Head. *Of the Legalneſs of the proceeding of this Council.*

1. That a Council may be Legal, and Obligatory, in ſome of its Acts, when not in others, §. 127.

2. That no Decree concerning Faith was paſſed in this Council, where any conſiderable party contradicted, §. 128.
3. That there was no need of uſing any violence upon this Council for the condemning of the Proteſtant Opinions; in condemning which, the Fathers of this Council unanimouſly agreed, §. 150.
4. That no violence was uſed upon the Council, for defining of Points debated between the Catholicks themſelves, §. 152.
Where,
Of the Councils proceedings, touching the chief points in debate.
Touching, 1. Epiſcopal Reſidency, Jure Divino, §. 153.
2. Epiſcopal Juriſdiction, Jure Divino, §. 154.
3. The Popes Superiority to Councils. §. 155.
That theſe three Points of Controverſie, however ſtated, are of no great advantage to the Reformed, §. 156.
5. That no violence was uſed upon the Council, for hindring any juſt Reformations. §. 157.

CHAP. X.

6. That no violence was inferred upon the liberty of the Council, as to the defining any thing therein, contrary to the General Approbation,
By,
1. The Popes Legats propoſing the things to be handled there, §. 160.
2. The Conſultation made, in every thing, with the Pope, §. 164.
3. The exceſsive number of Italian Biſhops, §. 167. And, the not voting, by Nations, but by the Preſent Prelats, §. 169.
4. The Popes giving Penſions, §. 170.
5. And admitting Titular Biſhops., §. 171.
6. The Prohibition of Biſhops Proxies to give Definitive votes §. 172.

CHAP. XI.

IV. Head. *Of the Councils many Definitions and Anathemas.*

1. That all Anathemas are not inflicted, for holding ſomething againſt Faith, §. 173.
2. That matters of Faith have a great latitude: and ſo conſequently, the errors, that oppoſe Faith, and, are lyable to be Anathematized, §. 175.
Where;

Of the ſeveral waies, wherein things are ſaid to be of Faith, §. 176.

3. *That all general Councils to the worlds end have equal* Authority *in defining matters of Faith*: And, *by the more Definitions, the Chriſtian Faith is ſtill more perfected*, § 177.

Where,

Of the true meaning of the Epheſin Canon, *reſtraining* Additions *to the Faith*, §. 178.

4. *That the* Council *of* Trent *prudently abſtained from the determining of many Controverſies, moved there*, §. 184.

5. *That the Lutherans many erroneous opinions in matters of Faith engaged the Council to ſo many contrary Definitions*, §. 185.

6. *That all the Anathemas of this Council extend not to meer Diſſenters*, §. 186.

7. *That this Council, in her Definitions, decreed no new divine Truth, or new matter of Faith, which was not formerly ſuch, at leaſt in its neceſſary Principles.*

Where,

In what ſence Councils may be ſaid to make new Articles of Faith, and in what, not, §. 192.

8. *That the chief Proteſtant-Controverſies, defined in this* Council *of* Trent, *were ſo in former Councils*, § 198.

9. *That the Proteſtant-Churches have made new* Counter-*Definitions as particular as the Roman; and obliged their Subjects to believe, and ſubſcribe them*, §. 199.

10. *That a diſceſſion from the Church, and declaration againſt its Doctrines, was made by Proteſtants, before they were any way ſtraitned, or provoked, by the* Trent *Decrees, or* Pius *his Creed*, §. 202.

CHAP. XII.

V. Head. *Of the Decrees of this Council concerning Reformation.*

1. *In matters, concerning the* Pope *and Court of* Rome.

1. *Appeales*, §. 212. *and Diſpenſations*, §. 215. 2. *Collation of Benefices*, §. 218. 3. *Penſions*. §. 218. *Commenda's*, §. 219. *and uniting of Benefices*, § 220 4. *Exemptions*, §. 221. 5. *Abuſes concerning* Indulgences, *and* Charities *given to pious uſes*, §. 223.

2. *In matters concerning the* Clergy.

1. *Unfit perſons many times admitted into H. Orders, and Benefices*, §. 225. 2. *Pluralities*, §. 232. 3. *Non Reſidence*, §. 235.

§. 235. 4. *Neglect of Preaching and Catechising*, §. 236. n. 2. 5. *Their restraint from Marriage; and Incontinency in Celibacy*, §. 238, 239. 6. *Their with-holding from the people the Communion of the Cup*, §. 241. 7. *Too frequent use of Excommunication*, §. 243. n. 1. 8. *The many disorders in Regulars and Monasticks*, §. 243. n. 2. 9. *Several defects in the Missals, and Breviaries*, §. 243. n. 3.

CHAP. XIII.

Solutions of the Protestant Objections.

Brief Answers to the Protestant-Objections, made before, §. 3. *&c.* — § 247. *&c.*

Where,

Of the Councils joyning Apostolical Tradition with the Holy Scriptures as a Ground of Church-Definitions, §. 264.

CHAP XIV.

Considerations concerning a Limited Obedience to Church-Authority.

1. *Of the pretence of following Conscience against Church-Authority.*

Two *Defences against obeying, or yielding assent to*, Church Authority, §. 271.

1. *The necessity of following our* Conscience.
2. *The certainty of a* Truth, *that is opposed by the* Church.

Reply to the first,

That *following our* Conscience, *when misinformed, excuseth not from fault*, §. 272.

Three waies, whereby the Will *usually corrupts the* Judgment *or* Conscience, *and misleads it, as it pleaseth, in matters of Religion.*

1. *Diverting the intellect to other imployments, and not permitting it at all to study and examine, matters of* Religion, §. 274.
2. *Permitting an inquiry, or search, into matters of* Religion: *but this not impartial, and universal*, § 275.
3. *Admitting a free, and universal, search as to other points controverted in* Religion, *but not as to* Church-Authority, §. 277.

Where,

Where.
That the Judgment may, and often doth, oblige men to go againſt their own Opinions, and ſeeming Reaſon, §. 278.

CHAP. XV.

Conſiderations;
For remedying the firſt Deceit, §. 281.
Where.
Whether Salvation may be had in any Chriſtian Profeſſion, retaining the Fundamentals of Faith, §. 282.
For remedying the ſecond Deceit, §. 289.
Where; *That perſons, not wholy reſigned to* Church-Authority, *ought to be very jealous of their preſent opinions: and indifferent, as Reaſons may move, to change their Religion*, Ib.
For remedying the third, § 291.
Where,
1. *That the Illiterat, or other perſons unſatisfied, ought to ſubmit, and adhere, to* Church-Authority, §. 294.
That apparent miſchiefs follow the Contrary, §. 296.
2. *That, in preſent* Church-Governours *divided, and guiding a contrary way, ſuch perſons ought to adhere to the Superiors, and thoſe, who by their Authority conclude the whole*: §. 298.
3. *As for* Church-Authority *paſt, ſuch perſons to take the teſtimony, concerning it, of the* Church-Authority *preſent*, §. 301.
Yet, That it may be eaſily diſcerned by the Modern Writings, what preſent Churches moſt diſſent from the Primitive. §. 302.
Where; of the aſperſion of Antiquity with Antichriſtianiſme, §. 311

CHAP. XVI.

2. *Of the pretence of Certainty, againſt* Church-Authority.

Reply to the 2d *Defence, The pretended certainty of a Truth, againſt* Church-Authority, §. 318.
1. *That it is a very difficult thing to arrive to a rational, and demonſtrative certainty, in matters intellectual; more, in matters Divine, and Spiritual; and eſpecially, in ſuch Divine matters,*

ters, where Church-Authority delivers the contrary for a certain Truth, Ibid.

Inſtances made in four principal points of modern Controverſie: For which Church-Authority *is, by many Proteſtants, charged with Idolatry, and Sacriledge,* §. 320.

1. *The Corporal preſence, and conſequently Adoration, of Chriſts Body and Blood in the Euchariſt,* §. 321.

2. *Invocation of Saints,* 322.

3. *Veneration of Images,* § 323.

4. *Communion in one kind,* §. 324.

2 *That ſuch certainty, if in a Truth of ſmall importance, though it cannot yield an obedience of Aſſent to Church-Authority, yet ſtands obliged ſtill to an obedience of ſilence.* §. 330,

Conceded by Proteſtants, §. 331.

3. *That ſuch Certainty of a Truth, never ſo important, and neceſſary, (where alſo one is to be certain, that it is ſo,) though it be ſuppoſed free from the obedience, of Aſſent; and of ſilence; yet ſtands obliged to a third, a paſſive obedience, to Church-Authority, a peaceable undergoing the Churches Cenſures (though this be the heavieſt, Excommunication; and that unjuſt;) without erecting, or joyning to, any other external Communion, divided from it. Which third obedience only yielded, preſerves the Church from ſchiſme,* §. 332, 333.

CON-

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE Council of Trent.

CHAP. I.

Proteſtant-Objections againſt this Council.

Objected *by Proteſtants,*

1. *That the Council of* Trent *was not a General Council.* §. 3.
2. *That, not Patriarchal.* §. 4.
3. *That, not Free and Legal, in its Proceedings.* §. 5.
4. *That, Several of its Deciſions are without, or contrary to, Scripture, to Primitive Tradition; and Tyrannically Impoſed,* §. 6.
5. *That the Decrees of the Council touching Reformation were meerly Deluſory.* §. 6.

THE moſt General Councils that can be procured joyned alſo with S. *Peter's* Chair, being aſſerted in the former *Diſcourſes* † as the Supreme, and Final, Judge, and Decider, of Eccleſiaſtical Controverſies; And (of theſe Councils) That of *Trent* being, as the laſt, ſo, particularly applied to the Examining and Determination of all thoſe Points of Difference, which have lateſt afflicted theſe Weſtern Churches; ſo that, if the Proteſtant Party could be induced to accept, and acquieſce in, its Judgment, all modern Controverſies of moment were ended; it ſeems neceſſary, for perfecting the Deſign of the former *Diſcourſes,* in the

§. 1.

†. Of the Guide in Controverſies.

laſt place ſo far to vindicate the Supream, Legal, and Obliging Authority of this Council, from the many Objections, which Proteſtants bring againſt it; as that the more moderate among them may clearly ſee, that, if they are willing to ſubmit either their Judgment, or their Silence, to any ſuch Council, as the preſent times of the Church can afford, they have no juſt reaſon to deny it to this of *Trent*.

To manifeſt which, I will firſt ſet you down the chief Particulars, that are ordinarily urged by the later Reformed Writers againſt It: And then, ſhew you, what, in the ſame Particulars, may be ſaid for it: leaving both to your ſober Arbitrement; as in a matter which is of no leſs concernment to you, than the ſetling of your Faith in ſo many weighty Points of Religion, as this Learned and Wiſe Aſſembly hath determined: About which Points others ſtill remain queſtioning, and diſputing; Divided, as from the Church, ſo among themſelves; and uncapable of a Remedy.

I wiſh you, in the Reading of this, accompanied with *Soave's* Hiſtory, on the one hand, and that of *Pallavicino*, on the other; to whom, for avoiding tedioufneſs, I ſhall often refer you. To the firſt, as an Author of much Reputation with Proteſtants; and one, who, it ſeems, would let no Falſity paſs, prejudicial to their Intereſt. To the ſecond, as One, who, though of an oppoſite ſide, yet, contrary to *Soave's* practice, is careful, in matters of Weight, to ſignifie the Writings, from which he extracts his Intelligence; Nor do I, herein, exact from a Proteſtant Reader more credit to him, than his Margin, or other known Hiſtory ſecures. Yet, if that be true, that *Ceſar Aquilino*, a Roman Catholick, and quoted for this by a late Proteſtant Writer ||, ſaith of him. — *That he hath done more diſ-* ||*Stillingfl. Rat. Account* p. 481. *ſervice to the Church of* Rome *by his Anſwer, than ever Father* Paul [the unmasked *Pietro Soave*] *did with his Hiſtory*, I have reaſon from this alſo to hope, that what I ſhall have occaſion to cite out of him, will paſs with the more credit, and better acceptation to a Proteſtant Reader, ſince both the firſt, and ſecond, of theſe Hiſtories are ſtill pretended to advance their Cauſe. And, yet further, ſince the things, wherein *Aquilino* ||*Aquilino*, p. 95. ſaith || this diſſervice conſiſts, are theſe — '*Quod in illâ Hiſtoriâ* '*offendatur Romanorum Pontificum fama*: — *Hæreticorum dicta enu-* '*merantur, & amplificantur*: — *Rixæ, Contentiones & Scandala* '*inter Catholicos, quæ in Concilio acciderunt, ſigillatim referuntur*

[out

[out of the *Vatican Archives* he perused] — *Quæ bona & recta* [he means, advantageous to the Catholick Cause] *à* Petro Soave *enarrata, vel minuuntur, vel pretermittuntur, vel in contradictionem vocantur*; in all which *Pallavicino* seems only censured, [v] for not writing more cautiously, and partially, on the Roman side; [2] and for not drawing the Council, and the Actions of it much fairer, and smoother, than the Truth, in those secret Papers, and Records he consulted, did discover them; [3] lastly, for imprudently publishing, what the greatest Patrons of this Council are said † to have hitherto, with the greatest Art, concealed, I shall, I say, the more confidently for this make use of his Testimony, without any further Vindication of his Veracity; desiring Protestants to make their advantages of an Author reported so much assisting their Pretensions; and partaking so little of the Arts of a Politician; and, that valued more the fidelity of an Historian, than the promoting of the *Roman*, or *his own*, Interest; which Himself also sometimes as *freely* professeth, as they say, *truly*; observing——*That History is like a Picture, then better, and more commendable, when it represents, not what is fairest; but, what likest to the Original.*

† *Soave*, *l.* Init.

§ 2.

This Council, then, being assembled since *Luther*'s Reformation, and purposely disallowing, and condemning it, very solicitous, and diligent have the *Reformed* likewise been in multiplying Arguments against it. Especially, they being assisted with the *History* thereof delivered by *Petro Soave Polano, i. e.* as is supposed by Protestants, *Father Paul*, a *Venetian Friar*. Yet, indeed, against whose sincerity in compoling this work, there seem not wanting many real *Exceptions*; if you please to consider with me,

Five material Exceptions against Soave's History.

1. [1] First, That he lived in the time of the great dissention between the State of *Venice*, and the Pope; and then also, was engaged in Writings against the Pope's Proceedings; whence he may be suspected, in this work also, to have been too much biassed by a contrary Interest.

2. [2] Again, That, whenas he was but eleven years old at the concluding of this Council, and so could write nothing out of his own knowledge, but out of the Relations, and Notes of others, Printed, or Manuscript; yet very seldom, in things of so great moment, doth he inform the Reader, whence he extracts his matter; and is contradicted, in many of his Relations, by *Pallavicino*, referring, herein, to the Records of this Council, extant in several places, and to many other Writings sufficiently

ciently common, of ſuch Perſons, as were *Members* of the *Council*, or publickly employed in its Affairs, (the Names of which he ſets down in his *l.* 18. *c.* 10. *n.* 14. and out of which, he ſaith, he compiled a good part of his own work): yet, none of which Writings, (as he collects from ſeveral paſſages of his Hiſtory) had come to *Soave's* view.

3. [3] Next, That, for thoſe things, wherein this *Author* lies under no ſuſpicion of *Errour*, as to the matter related; yet ſeems he frequently very culpable as to the *Colours*, he lays upon it. For, whereas no action can be for its ſubſtance ſo good, but that it may be vitiated, and change its nature from ſeveral Circumſtances, ſo often as it is done out of an ill intention, or for ſome impious end, of Policy, Ambition, Covetouſneſs, or the like; Nor, again, ſcarce any Truth can be, in its own light, ſo clear, and evident, but that ſome Veri-ſimilities may be ranged on the other ſide, to obſcure, and cloud it; this Author, for the *firſt* of theſe, through the courſe of his Hiſtory, may be obſerv'd (contrary to the Modeſty which is particularly proper to Hiſtorians) to aſperſe, and blemiſh the moſt ſpecious, and candid actions of thoſe (though the moſt ſacred Perſons) whoſe intereſts he diſfavours, with ſome or other uncharitable Gloſs upon them; and to repreſent the faireſt fruit they bear, ſtill worm-eaten with ſome corrupt Deſign, or malignant Intention; for which a bare poſſibility thereof ſeems his ſufficient warrant to affirm it. And again, for the ſecond; conſtantly after each Seſſion of this Council, He, under the Mask of the vulgar talk, and common Fame, takes liberty to ſum together all that, which he apprehends may any way diſparage the precedent Decrees; and that which perhaps never entred into any ones, ſave his own, fancy.

4. [4] Laſtly, That he was a Perſon, with whom the Arch-Biſhop of *Spalato* had an intimate Acquaintance; and of whom alſo he gives this Character (in the Preface to the firſt Edition of this Hiſtory, *London*, 1619. which Preface is omitted in the latter, as ſome think, becauſe it too manifeſtly diſcovers the Hiſtorians Diſ-affection to thoſe, whoſe actions he relates): 'That 'he lived ſo in the Roman Captivity, as to guide himſelf by a right 'Conſcience rather, than the common Cuſtoms: That he had 'a great Zeal to the purity of Religion, againſt ſuch unexcuſa-'ble [*i. e.* Roman] depravations thereof; That he abhorred 'thoſe, who defended the Church of *Rome's* abuſes, as holy In-'ſtitutions; and profeſſed, Truth, wherever found, was 'to be embraced; That this his work was only known to him, 'and ſome others, his great Confidents. From which, as alſo from

from ſome Extracts out of his Letters holding correſpondence with ſome French *Hugonots* (mentioned in *Caſoni*'s Preface to the Second Volume of *Pallavicino*) may eaſily be gathered, that his Religion was much-what of the ſame temper and complexion, with that of *Spalatenſis*: Unleſs perhaps we may think, that, after his writing this Book, he return'd to a better mind; and that, from this change, came that reluctance of his, *Spalatenſis* mentions ||, for communicating this work; Nay, (as the ſame Biſhop relates it ||) a Purpoſe, to have quite ſuppreſſed, and made it away; , *Deſtinato ad eſſere Sommerſo dal ſuo Genitore.* Which thing as he imputes to his fear of ſome danger from it; ſo Charity will rather judge, that it proceeded from remorſe of Conſcience; when, in a pious reflection upon his former Conceptions, he diſcern'd, that, in ſtead of an Hiſtory, he had brought forth a Satyre, againſt Gods Truth, and his Church, and the moſt *Supreme*, and *Sacred* of thoſe Governors, whom our Lord himſelf had appointed over It, and Him. However, This his *Hiſtory* hath not ſo far corrupted the truth of Affairs, as not to contain in it many Evidences, very advantageous to the *Catholick Cauſe*; and ſo much remains ſound in it, as may ſerve very well to confute that which is vitiated; and in the main things, that are charged againſt the Pope, and Council, (eſpecially concerning the Councils Liberty), this Hiſtory is found as it were, to deſtroy it ſelf, by its own Contradictions. A thing, which, obſerved by *Phil. Quorlius* an Italian Doctor, produced his Book entituled; , *Hiſtoria* Petri Soavis *ex Authoriſmet aſſertionibus confutata*. This account, in my entrance, I thought fit to give you of this Author, that you may ſee what juſt credit, on ſuch a Subject, he deſerves, out of whoſe Quiver the Reformed have taken moſt of thoſe arrows, with which they ſeek to wound this Council. The chief of which I ſhall firſt ſummarily relate to you, and ſo proceed to its intended Defence.

|| Prefat. to *Soave's* Hiſtory.

§ 3.

First then, it is Objected by the Proteſtant Divines, That this of *Trent* can no way truly be called a *General Council*, as it is ſtiled by the *Romaniſts*. a 'Becauſe it is 'neceſſary to the Generalneſs of a Council, that ſome be there, 'and thoſe Authorized, from all particular Churches. [See Archbiſhop *Lawd*, § 27. n. 3. where he quotes *Bellarmine* || for it,] But none from the Eaſtern Churches were preſent in 'this of *Trent*, or ſo much as ſummoned; or, afterwards, ap'proved, or conſented unto, its Acts: And β the number 'of the Biſhops, who were preſent from other Churches, was 'frequently

1.

a. *Anſ.* — §. 247.

|| *De Concil.* l. 1. c. 17. §. 4. *ut ſal-tem.*

β. — §. 248.

'frequently so small, that in many Sessions it had scarce 10. 'Arch-Bishops, or 40, or 50 Bishops, present [Bishop *Laud*, '§. 27. n. 2.] And, That it had not so many Bishops pre-'sent at the Determination of the weightiest Controversies con-'cerning the Rule of Faith, as the King of *England* could have 'called together in his own Dominions at any one time upon a 'Months warning (B. *Brambal*, Vindic. c. 9. p. 247. And see what *Soave* saith to the same purpose, *l.* 2. *p.* 163.) Add

Ans: - §. 249. γ. ro this, γ. 'That it was not lawfully called, so as General 'Councils ought, and used to be; namely, by the Emperor, and 'other Christian Princes; but only by the Pope [this was one 'of *Henry* the 8th's Pleas in his *Manifesto's* against it.] Last-

— §. 250. δ. ly, δ. 'That the Popes themselves, as many as lived in the 'time thereof, would never consent, that this Council should 'be affirmed to represent the *Universal Church*; prudently fore-'seeing, that if this were granted (as in the Council of *Con-'stance* it was) the Council, as being the whole, would put off 'its subjection, and depend no longer on the Pope, that was but a 'part of it; nor would need his confirmation to render it what it 'was before; *viz.* the Representative of the whole Church [thus Dr. *Hammond*. Her. 11. §. n 8, 9.] This against its being a General Council.

§. 4.

2.

— §. 251. ε. 2. That neither was it a plenary *Patriarchal Council*, for the West. ε. Because from some Churches in the West, as from the *Britannick*, and some other Reformed Churches, there were no Bishops present there; who also had just cause for their not coming thither (B. *Laud*, ib. n. 2.): neither can it justly be pleaded, that they were Heretical, or Schismatical Churches, being never condemned by any former Council (B. *Brambal*, Answer to *Chalced.* p. 351.)

— §. 251. ζ. ζ. And, of other Western Churches, (save only *Italy*) present very few; in all the Sessions under *Paul* the 3*d.* but two *Frenchmen*; and sometimes, none; as, in the sixth Session under *Julius* the 3*d.* (B. *Laud*, ib. n. 2.) And

— §. 252. η. η. Twice so many Bishops out of *Italy* present, as there were 'out of all other Christian Nations put together, (B. *Bramb.* 'Vind. p. 247.) as appears at the end of the Council; where 'the *Italians* are set down 187. and all the rest make but 83.

— §. 252. ϑ. '(B. *Laud*, §. 29. n. 2.) ϑ. Neither was this Council, after its 'rising, fully acknowledged, or received, by the Western 'Churches; nor, by the *Britannick*, and other Reformed Chur-

— §. 253. ι. 'ches; ι. Not, by the *Gallican* Church of the Roman Communi-'on: And, Let no man say (saith B. *Bramh.* Vind. p. 248.)

that

'that they rejected the Determinations thereof only in point of '*Diſcipline*, not of *Doctrine*; for the ſame Canonical Obedi-'ence is equally due to an acknowledged General, [I add, or o-'ther Superior] Council in point of Diſcipline, as in point of 'Doctrine.

§. 5.

3. 'That it was not a *Free*, and *Lawful Council*.

1. λ. 'Where the accuſers, or the accuſed (take, 'whether you pleaſe) namely, the Pope, and the Biſhops, 'perſons of the ſame perſwaſion, and communion with him, 'ſate as Judges in their own cauſe; namely, in a Queſtion, of the 'Popes Supremacy, and of the corruptions of that Church (ſee 'B. L. §. 27. n. 1. and *Henry* 8. *Manifeſto's*.) μ. Eſpecially Pope 'Leo in his Bull having declared and pronounced the Appellants 'Hereticks, before they were condemned by the Council.

2. ν. 'Where was no ſecurity in the place of Meeting, 'for the Reformed party to come thither; nor where no form 'of Safe-conduct could be truſted, ſince the cruel Decrees, and 'behaviour of the Council of *Conſtance* towards *John Huſs*, 'though armed with a ſafe Conduct. ξ. Whither alſo, notwith-'ſtanding this, ſome of the Proteſtant party being come, yet 'they were not ſuffered to propoſe, and diſpute their cauſe: And 'again, ο. Where, after diſpute, (had it been granted them) 'yet they, if no Biſhops, could not have been permitted to 'have had any deciſive vote with the reſt; but muſt, after the 'Diſputation, have been judged, and cenſured by their Adverſa-'ries. 3. ρ. Where all the Members of the Council, that 'had a vote, had takan an *Oath* of *Fidelity* to the Papacy; and 'none had ſuffrage, but ſuch as were ſworn to the Church of '*Rome*, and were profeſſed enemies to all that called for Refor-'mation, or a free Council; (B. *Laud*, §. 27. n. 1.) 4. σ. * Where 'nothing might be voted or debated in Council, but only what 'the Popes Legates propoſed; the Popes Commiſſion running, '*Proponentibus Legatis*; &c. * where nothing was determined, till 'the Popes judgment thereof was brought from *Rome*, (him-'ſelf not vouchſafing to be preſent therein); and therefore, it 'was commonly ſaid, that this Council was guided by the Holy 'Ghoſt ſent from *Rome* in a Male. 5. τ. Where many 'Biſhops had Penſions from the Pope; and many Biſhops were 'introduced, who were only titular; and || divers new Biſhop-'ricks alſo erected by the Pope, during the Council; all this to 'enable therein the *Papalines* to over-vote the *Tramontanes*: 'and hence, ſuch an unproportionable number, there, of *Italian* 'Biſhops,

3. Anſwered
λ. 1. — §. 254.
μ. — §. 255.
ν. 2. — §. 256.
ξ. — §. 257.
π — §. 258.
ρ. 3. — §. 259.
σ. 4. — §. 260.
σ. — §. 261.
τ. 5. — §. 262.

|| B. *Bramh.* Vindic. of Ch. of *Engl.* p. 248.

4. υ.

§. 6.

v. 4.

4. v. Suppose the Council, in all these Objections, cleared; suppose it never so Oecumenical, and Legal; yet have the Reformed this Reserve, after all, wherefore they cannot justly entertain it; * 'Because some of the *Decrees*, and Definitions, are repugnant to the *Holy Scriptures*; or, at least, not 'warranted by them, φ This Council not regulating its 'proceedings wholly by the Scriptures, as the *Nicene*, and other primitive Councils did; but holding Tradition *extra* '*Scripturam* a sufficient Ground of making Definitions in matter of Faith. [Concerning which, thus Arch-Bishop *Lawd*, §. 28. — *The Scripture must not be departed from in Letter, or in necessary sense, or the Council is not Lawful. For the consent and confirmation of Scripture is of far greater authority, to make the Council Authentical, and the Decisions of it,* de fide, *than any confirmation of the Pope can be.* — *Now the Council of* Trent, *we are able to prove, had not the first,* [but have departed from the Letter, and sense of Scripture] *and so we have no reason to respect the second.* See likewise, §. 27. n. 1.] Where he asks — *How that Council is Legal, which maintains it lawful to conclude a Controversie, and make it to be* de fide, *though it hath not the written word of God for warrant, either in express Letter, or necessary sence, and deduction; but is quite* extra, *without, the Scripture?* — See also Mr *Stillingfl.* p. 477, & 478.] —— χ., Or * Because some 'of its *Decrees* are repugnant to, or at least not warranted by, '*Primitive* and *Apostolical Tradition* ||. ψ. And, in the last place, 'Because this Council hath imposed *Anathema's*, in 'these, and in many other slight mattets (if truths,) upon all 'those, who shall dissent from, or at least, who shall contradict, 'their Judgment in them; (this one Council having made near 'hand as many Canons, as all the preceding Councils of the 'Church put together:) || and among these hath added 12 new 'Articles to the former Creeds; * drawn up bp *Pius* the 4th. according to the order of the Council ||: and * imposed to be 'believed by all, who would enter into the communion of the 'Church; contrary to the 7th. *Can.* of the Third General Council at *Ephesus*. All these Articles Imposed too, as Fundamental; and to be assented to, as absolutely, and explicitly, for attaining salvation, as the Articles of the Creed; and so, that, 'in disbelieving any of them, it profits nothing to have held 'all the rest of the Catholick Faith entire; which Articles are 'concluded, there, as the *Athanasian* Creed, with an —— *Hæc*

'*vera*

Dr. *Hammond* of *Her.* §. 11. n. 3, 7.

|| *Soave*, p. 228.

|| *Sess.* 24. c. 12. *de Refor.*

'*vera Catholica Fides, extra quam nemo Salvus*' || (ſaith Mr. *Thorndyke* †) *it was the Acts of this Council, that framed the Schiſme; becauſe whenas the Reformation might have been proviſional, till a better underſtanding between the Parties might have produced a tolerable agreement, this proceeding of* Trent *cut off all hopes of Peace, but by yielding to all their Decrees.*

So that

|| See Archbiſhop *Laud*, p. 51.—Biſhop *Bramh.* Vindic. of Church of *England*, p. 230. 231.—Reply to *Chalced.* p. 312.—Dr. *Hammond*, Arſ. to Cath. Gent. p. 138.---and to Schiſm Diſarm'd, p. 241.--- Dr. *Fern*, Conſiderations touching Reformation, p. 45. ---*Stillingfl.* Rat. Account, p. 48, &c.

† *Epilog. Concluſion*, p. 413.

§. 6. n. 2.

5 This for the Articles touching *Doctrine*. And next, For thoſe of *Reformation*, which alſo are very numerous; and, one would think, the more, the better: yet, theſe alſo are not free from their complaints. ω. 'That theſe Decrees are 'meer Illuſions; many of them of ſmall weight; taking Motes 'out of the eye, and leaving Beams. That the Council, in fra-'ming them, imitated the Phyſitian, who, in an Hectical Body, 'laboured to kill the Itch: That the Diſeaſes in the Church are 'ſtill preſerved, and ſome Symptomes only, cured. That, in 'ſome of more conſequence, the Exceptions are larger, than 'the Rule: And ωω. That the Popes Diſpenſative power 'may null and qualifie them, as he pleaſeth. (Thus *Soave* frequently.) 'That nothing of Reformation followed up-'on them, and the moſt important things to that end could ne-'ver paſs the Council; and, it ended, ββ. great rejoycing in '*Rome*, that they had cheated the world ſo, that that, which was 'intended to clip the wings of the Court of *Rome*, had confirm-'ed and advanced the Intereſt of it ||.

5 Answered.

ω. — §. 268.

ωω. — §. 269.

ββ. — §. 269.

|| *Stillingfl.* Rat. Acc. p. 480, 482.

Moſt of theſe Objections you may find, after *Soave*, urged; by Archbiſhop *Laud*, §. 27, &c. and reinforced, in his Defence, by Mr. *Stillingfl.* p. 2. c. 8.—By B. *Bramh.* Vind. c. 9. —By Dr. *Hammond*, of Her. §. 11. and many others; whether with more force, and advantage, than is here ſet down, I muſt deſire you to conſult the Authors.

§. 7.

Theſe are the principal *Exceptions*, occurring in later *Proteſtant-Writers* againſt the *Council* of *Trent*. Now I deſire your patience to hear on the other ſide, what may be ſaid for it. Which *Council*, being, by reaſon of the ſubjection of the Clergy to ſo many ſupreme and independent Princes, with ſo much difficulty conven'd; not finally concluded till 18 years after its firſt

first sitting; interrupted by sickness; interrupted by wars; managed under several Popes of several inclinations; and under often-changed interests of most warlike, and rival Princes, according to their several advantages or disgusts, who now sent, now withdrew their Bishops, and desired to model its Decrees to the content of their Subjects, and secular Peace in their Dominions; It must needs encounter great diversity of Accidents, and not always retain the same face, security, frequency, splendor, and reputation, nor the same purity, and dis-engagement from secular affairs, and national obligations.

Again, * Sitting in the time, and for the composing, of the greatest, and the most powerful (considering the engagement of the common people, as well as of Princes) separation and division, that ever was in the Christian Church, which departed also, from the former unity; in so many points of Doctrine and Discipline, as never did any before; and * driving two main designs at once, the reformation of manners in the Church, and its Governors; and the confutation of errors in the Sectaries, It must needs be liable to many *Intestine*, as well as *External*, affronts and hinderances from all sides; and, in so many decisions, seem to some, to commit not a few oversights. But yet, notwithstanding all these Intrigues, and all, that is produced against it, I see not, but that both its *Authority*, and *Integrity* may be rationally and justly vindicated.

§. 8. The *Considerations* upon it, for the more orderly proceeding in them, I shall reduce to these Heads

1. Concerning the *Generality*, *Liberty*, and just *Authority*, of this Council, or of the persons constituting it, to oblige the Churches Subjects; or especially, those of the *West*.

2. Concerning the *Invalidity*; and also, probably, the *uneffectiveness* of such a *General Council*, as the Protestants, in stead thereof, demanded; and, as should be limited with all the conditions they proposed.

3. Concerning the *Legal Proceedings* of this Council of *Trent*, especially as to those matters, which respect the *Protestants*.

4. The many *Definitions* and *Anathema's* of this *Council*, and its pretended-new Articles of Faith.

5. Concerning the many *Constitutions*, and *Acts* of great consequence, passed in this *Council*, and confirmed by the *Pope*, for the *Reformation* of several corrupt practices, and disorders, observed in the Churches *Government*, or *Discipline*.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of Councils inferior to General.

The due Subordinations, and other Regulations, of them, §. 9.

1. *The ſeveral Councils, at leaſt ſo high as the Patriarchal, to be called, and moderated, by their reſpective Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, or Preſidents; and nothing to be paſſed by them, without his; or by Him, without their, conſent.* §. 10.
2. *No Introduction, or Ordination, of Inferior Clergy to be made without Approbation, or Confirmation of the Superior.* §. 11.
3. *Differences between Inferiors, upon Appeal, to be decided by Superiors: and thoſe of higher perſons, and in greater Cauſes, by the Biſhop of the firſt See.* §. 12. *(where, concerning his conteſt, about this, with the* Africans, §. 13. n. 2.*)*

Yet; that no perſons, or Synods, co-ordinate might uſurp authority one over another: Nor, all Cauſes aſcend to the Higheſt Courts; and, many, without troubling the Synod, in its Interval to be decided by its Preſident, §. 14.

4. *Obedience, in any diſſent happening amongſt Superiors, to be yielded to the Superior of them.*

The Conceſſions of Learned Proteſtants, touching the Precedents, §. 16.

5. *No Addreſſes, or Appeals, permitted, from the Superior Eccleſiaſtical, to any ſecular, Judge, or Court.* §. 20.

Where, That the Church, from the beginning, was conſtituted a diſtinct Body from the Civil State, §. 21.

And, what ſeem to be Her Rights and Priviledges, (as ſo diſtinct.) §. 22.

§. 9.

CONcerning the firſt Head; to diſcern, more clearly, the true State of this *Council*, aſſembled at *Trent*, It ſeems neceſſary, that I, firſt, give you a brief account of ſome things more *generally* appertaining to theſe *Eccleſiaſtical Courts*.

Of *Councils* then aſſembled, as need required, for deciding Controverſies, enacting Laws, and preſerving the Peace of the Church Catholick, (which is but *one*, throughout the world);

there have been always used in the Church these several Kinds, or Compositions, subordinate in Dignity, and Authority, one to another, [1] *Episcopal*, or *Diocesan*; [2] *Provincial*, [3] *National*, [4] *Patriarchal*, and [5] *Oecumenical*, or General. Of which Councils the first Pattern, under the Gospel, was that held at *Jerusalem*, Act. 15. *A. D.* 51.

Amongst these, the lowest Synod, or Ecclesiastical Council, for governing the Church, was *Episcopal*, or *Diocesan* (taking the word in its modern sence): consisting of the *Bishop* of any particular *Diocess*, and his *Presbyters*; *the Bishop* calling them together, and moderating the Assembly, the Actions and Decrees, of which Synod were appealable from, and liable to the Judgment, and Censure, of an higher Council.

The next Council was *Provincial*; consisting of all the Bishops of a *Province* (in which were many Dioceses): called, and moderated, and its Decrees executed, by the *Metropolitan*.

The next Synod (to whom also the Actions, and Decrees, of this Provincial were subject) was *National*; consisting of the Metropolitans of several Provinces with their Bishops; called, and moderated, by the chief Primate in such a Nation; such were several of the *African* Councils, and particularly, that held under S. *Cyprian*, *de Baptizandis Haereticis*; there being of these Provinces or greater Circuits, six in *Affrick*; and so many Primates, or *primae Sedis Episcopi*, of whom the Chief was the Bishop of *Carthage*.

The next, a Council *Patriarchal*; consisting of the Metropolitans, *&c.* of divers Kingdoms, and Countries, which were contained under the same *Patriarchy*; this called, and moderated by the *Patriarch*.

The last, and supremest, is a Council *Oecumenical*, or *General*; to which I should proceed next; to shew you, of what persons it is to consist: who is to *call*, who is to preside in, to regulate, and ratifie it, *&c.* But this I shall defer till §. 34. And, because the *Regulation*, and *Government* that is, for the necessary preserving of the Churches firmer Peace and Unity, established, and observed in these lower Councils, is, by their being more frequently held, much better known, and also freely acknowledged by Learned Protestants, I will first give you some further Account of this; that, so, you may make a better Judgment of the Nature, and Condition of *General Councils*, and of that, which is requisite in them, (at last to be applied to that of *Trent*): which General Councils, by reason of the Diffi-

Difficulty, Charge, and many other Inconveniences, of so universal an Assembly, have been much more rarely convened in the Church.

In these assemblies then fore-named; for the unity and peace of the Church, 1st. It was ordered; That the Inferiors, (though joyned in a Council) could establish nothing (in things that were of moment, and concern'd the whole Body; as in matters of Faith, and Manners, Ordination of Clergy, &c) without the Superiors, or Presidents, consent; nor He, without theirs, *i. e.* of the major part of them: For example; The *Presbyters* nothing, without their *Bishop*; nor the *Bishops*, without their *Metropolitan*; nor *Metropolitans*, without the *Primate*, or *Patriarch*; *& è contra.* Of which thus the 35. *Can. Apostol.*

—'*Episcopos Gentium singularum scire convenit; quis inter eos* 'primus [this ascends so high as Primats] *habeatur; quem*, ve-'*lut Caput existiment; & nihil amplius, præter ejus conscientiam,* 'gerant, *quàm illa sola singuli, quæ paræciæ propriæ & villis, quæ* 'sub eâ sunt, *competunt. Sed nec Ille, præter omnium conscienti-*'*am, faciat aliquid in eorum paræciis. Sic enim* Unanimitas *erit,* '*& glorificabitur Deus, per Christum, in Spiritu Sancto.*

And see the same repeated in *Conc. Antioch. Can.* 9. And, this Apostol. Can. there referred to; In which by ἄνευ τῆς τοῦ πρώτου γνώμης, *præter sententiam illius qui primus est*, must be understood, (not the Councils doing nothing without this Primate first *consulted*; and then, if He, and they, or a major part of them, do differ in opinion, He obliged to follow this major part, as some Protestants would have it ‖ quoting *Conc. Antiochen. c.* 19. as favouring such a sence: but) the Council's doing nothing without this Primates *consent*; the Council, or major part of it, and he the President, having both of them, a negative voice in respect of one another; and, so, such matters, as both do not concur in, being to remain undecided, till their agreement; or, till such Cause is by some party devolved to a Superior Court, (if such difference doth not happen in the Supreme). Otherwise, if, by (γνώμης) be meant, only *Knowledge*, or *Advice*, the one parties consulting, or acquainting the other with such a matter; then, since that Canon runs also, that the Primate shall do nothing *præter Episcoporum* [γνώμην] *sententiam*, yet this will not hinder, but that he, alone, may make such Decrees also, without the consent of the Council, or of the major part of them; and on neither side must the word signifie any more, than their *Counsel*, and *Advice*.

‖ *See Dr. Field, of the Church, p.* 511.

As

As for that passage of the 19th. *Antiochian* Canon urged——'*Obtineat Sententia plurimorum* (the like to which see *Conc. Nice*, Can. 6) it means only, That the unanimous suffrage of *all* the Provincial Bishops, joined with the Metropolitan, will not be necessary for the Ordination of a new Bishop; whenas perhaps some, *propter suum contentionis studium*, may contradict; and not; That such major part may pass such Acts *without*, or *against*, the Metropolitan: The *consent* of which Metropolitan, for the Ordination, or Confirmation of such a Bishop, is expressly required by the 4th. and 6th. Canon of the first General Council of *Nice*.

II. §. 11.

2ly. For preserving the same Peace, and Unity, it was so ordered; That no Bishop, in any Diocess, could be Ordained, or exercise any Jurisdiction belonging to such place, without the consent, or confirmation of the Metropolitan; nor Metropolitan, in any Province, without the Confirmation of the Patriarch. See *Can. Apost.* 35.—*Conc. Nic.* Can. 4, 6.—*Con c. Antioch. c.* 9. 19.—*Conc. Laodic. c.* 12.—2. *Conc. Carthag. c.* 12.—*Conc. Constantinop. c.* 2.—*Conc. Ephes. c.* 8, [Where note; That, not the *Confirmation* of the *Cyprian* Metropolitan, but the *Election* and *Ordination* of him (of which the *Cyprian* Bishops complained, that they were deprived), is denied in this Canon to the *Antiochian* Patriarch, as *Res nova*, and contrary to former Customs; this thing properly belonging to the Provincial Synod]—*Conc. Chalced.* 28.—And here note, that these later Canons maintain the *Mos antiquus obtineat*, of the 6th. *Nicene* Canon, and so preserve unviolated the ancient preeminencies of the Chief *Patriarches*, as well as those of interior *Primates*, or *Metropolitans*. After all which, the 8th. General Council, *Can.* 17, Reciting the foresaid 6th. Canon of *Nice*, thus explains it—— *Quâ pro causâ, & hac magna & sancta Synodus, tam in seniori, & novâ* Româ [Constantinopoli] *quam in Sede Antiochiæ, & Hierosolymorum, priscam consuetudinem decernit in omnibus conservari; ita, ut earum Præsules, universorum Metropolitanorum, qui ab ipsis promoventur, & sive per manus impositionem, sive per Pallii datione*m, *Episcopalis dignitatis firmitatem accipiunt, habeant potestatem*; viz. *ad convocandam eos, urgente necessitate, ad Synodalem Conventum*; *vel etiam ad coercendum illos, & corrigendum, cum fama eos super quibusdam delictis forsitan accusaverit.* Of which Canon, thus Dr. *Field*, p 5, 8.—*Patriarchs were, by the Order of the 8th. General Council* † *to confirm the Metropolitans subject unto them, either by Imposition of Hands, or giving the Pall.*

† Can. 17.

And

—And *l.* 5. *c.* 37. *p.* 551. —*Without the Patriarchs consent, none of the Metropolitans, subject unto them, might be Ordained.*—And —*What they bring* (saith he) *proves nothing that we ever doubted of; For we know, the Bishop of* Rome *had the Right of confirming the Metropolitans within the Precincts of his own Patriarchship, as likewise every other Patriarch had.* And thus B. *Bramhal*, (Vindic. *c.* 9. *p.* 259. &c.) —*What power the Metropolitan had over the Bishops of his own Province, the same had a Patriarch over the Metropolitans, and Bishops of sundry Provinces, within his own Patriarchate.* And afterward—*Wherein, then, consisted Patriarchal Authority? In Ordaining their Metropolitans, or Confirming them*, &c.

III. §. 12.

3ly. Again so ordered: That, any difference arising between any inferior, persons, or Councils, either of an equal degree; as between two Presbyters, or two Bishops, or their Synods; or an unequal; as between a Presbyter, and his Bishop; between a Bishop, and his Metropolitan; or their Synods; a repair, for the decision thereof, should be made to the next Person, or Council, Superior to both. Nor might obedience, by an Inferior, be denied to, or a discession made from, any Superior, upon something thought criminous in him, before such judgment of an higher Court were first passed, discharging such Inferiors of their duty. See *Conc. Nic.* Can. 4, 5, 6.—*Conc. Sard.* Can. 7. —*Conc. Chalced.* Can. 9.—8. General Council, *c.* 10. & 26. compared with the 17. expounding the 6th. Can. of the *Nicene* Council.

Thus then, all inferior Conciliar differences of much consequence were terminated if not sooner, ultimately in a General Council, when it could be had; & personal appeals, in the Interval of Councils, (which, whether Episcopal, Provincial, or Patriarchal, cannot be, upon every cause, without great trouble, & charge, convened), were, as for *greater* causes, and persons, (as those of the other Patriarchs, or eminent Bishops) ended by the *Prime Patriarch*, the Bishop of *Rome*; who made use of such Bishops for his Assessors, and Council, as could with convenience, upon such appeals, be brought together. See the Council of *Sardica*, *can.* 4, 5. Concerning the just Authority of which Council, I refer the Protestant-Reader to Mr. *Thorndikes* Defence thereof, *Epil. l.* 3, *c.* 21. *p.* 181. and *just weights*, p. 40.

But see this practice of Appeals to the First See much more ancient; not only, as to the West, in the Provinces subject §. 13. n. 1.

ject to this Patriarch: where we meet with the appeal of *Basilides*, and *Martialis*, two *Spanish* Bishops, desiring by him to be restored to their Bishopricks, of which they pretended they were unjustly deprived ||; (in which matter S. *Cyprian* † indeed blames the Pope, for receiving them rashly into his Communion, when he had not well examined their Cause, nor the justice of the former Sentence passed in *Spain* on them; but not at all, for his admitting, as Patriarch, their appeal): and find * the Request of the said S. *Cyprian* ||, made to the Pope for his Letter to the Bishops of *France*, to depose *Marcianus* a French Bishop, for siding with the *Novatians*; again *, the appeal of *Cæcilianus*, Primate of *Carthage*, who was wronged by a Council held in *Affrick*, to the Pope, and his Council; related, and justified against the *Donatists*, by S. *Austin*, Ep. 162. But, as to the East also; where we find the appeal of *Athanasius*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and of *Paulus* Bishop of *Constantinople*, wronged by the *Arrian*, Eastern, Synods: And, long before these, the appeal of *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, accused to the Pope by some of *Pentapolis* †, and so making his Defence to Him, and cleared by him and his Council.

All these, before the Decree of *Sardica*; as for the times after it, I suppose it needless to mention the appeals of S *Chrysostom* ||, *Theodoret* †, *Flavianus*, and other Eastern Bishops.

As for the famous Contest, that was had about these Appeals, between *Zozimus*, and *Bonifacius*, Popes, and the *African* Bishops, after *A. D.* 400, and after so many eminent former allowed Examples of such Appeals, 1st. The Constitution of those *African* Prelates in a Council, held about the same time (whether it were the *Milevitan*, or rather another at *Carthage*, as some think, it much matters not), prohibits such Appeals beyond Sea only to the inferior Clergy, in these words || —*Placuit, ut Presbyteri, Diaconi, vel cæteri inferiores Clerici, in causis, quas habuerint*, &c. *non provocent, nisi ad Affricana Concilia, vel ad Primates Provinciarum suarum.* But it enjoyns nothing concerning Bishops 2ly. In their dispute with *Boniface*, they handled the matter so gently, that, as *Baronius* observes † they seem'd to debate rather *de modo*, than *de Re*; bespeaking him on this manner ||—*Impendio deprecamur, ut ad vestras aures hinc venientes non* faciliùs *admittatis.* — Upon which words *Spalatensis* comments thus † —*Rogant ut* Episcopi *non tam* facilè *audiantur* [i. e. à Rom. Pontifice], *nisi* viz. *notoria, & manifesta adsit suspicio in propria Provincia Episcopis omnibus,*

§. 13. n. 2.

* || *Cyprian*, Ep 38.
† Ep. 68.
|| Ep. 67.
† *Athanas. de Sententia Dionys. Alexandrin.*
|| Ep. *ad Innocent.*
† Ep. *ad Leonem.*
| Conc. *Melevit. c.* 22.
† *A. D.* 412.
|| Ep. ad *Bonifac.*
† *l.* 4. *c.* 8. *n.* 32.

bus, aut maximâ eorum parte. For he grants there—*Ubi gravis & notoria est suspicio erga proprios & primarios Judices, Episcopos reos potuisse ad aliena,* [or extera], *judicia, præsertim verò ad sedes Apostolicas, recurrere*; and quotes, for it, S. *Austin*, Ep. 162. in *Cacilian's* case.] And—*Concilium Nicenum voluit observari, ne in suâ Provinciâ Communione suspensi, à suâ sanctitate, vel* festinatò, *vel* præproperè, *vel* indebitè *videantur communioni restitui.* For, the *common* practice of such Appeals in former times, by *Athanasius*, and others, shews; that the *Roman Bishop* was not prohibited by these Canons of *Nice* to admit into his Communion any such Bishop, as was excommunicated by his Province, if the *Roman* Bishop found him wrongfully suspended. And therefore 'tis true also, that the 6th. *Nicene* Canon—*Episcopos suis Metropolitanis apertissimè commisit* (which the *Affricans* urged) but not this in every case unappealable to Superiors, as appears by their former Qualification,—*Ne* festinatò, *ne* præproperè, *&c.* And, particularly for this Province of *Affrick*,—S. *Austin* undertakes, against the *Donatists*, a Justification of the Appeal made formerly to a Transmarine Judgment (the *Donatists* much opposing it) by *Cacilianus* Bishop of *Carthage*, when injur'd by an *Affrican* Council of 70 Bishops: The Father giving there his reason also for the Equity of such Appeal; because such *Ecclesia transmarina* was *à privatis inimicitiis, & ab utrâq; parte dissensionis, aliena.* Where also he justifies *Melchiades* Bishop of *Rome* his admission of this Appeal—*An fortè non debuit* (saith he) *Romanæ Ecclesiæ*, Melchiades, *Episcopus cum Collegis, transmarinis Episcopis, illud sibi usurpare judicium, quod ab Afris septuaginta, ubi Primus* [Numidiæ], *Tigisitanus præsedit, fuerat terminatum? Quid, quod nec usurpavit? Rogatus Imperator Judices misit Episcopos, qui eum eo sederent, & de totâ illâ causâ, quid justum videretur, statuerent.* And, a little after the foresaid Contest, in an Appeal made to Rome by one *Antonius*, constituted formerly Bishop of *Fussala* by S. *Austin*, This Father, writing an Epistle to Pope *Celestin* about it, there no way declines his Sentence, but only supplicates his favour, in it—*Collabora nobiscum, obsecro—& Jube, tibi, quæ directa sunt, omnia recitari—Existat exemplo, ipsâ Apostolica sede judicante, vel aliorum judicia firmante, quosdam,* &c. And the same Father relating to the forecited *Affrican* Canon ||, argues thus, against the *Donatists*, the lawfulness of *Cecilian's* Transmarine Appeal † —*Neq; enim* (saith he) *de Presbyteris, aut Diaconis, aut inferioris Ordinis clericis, sed de collegis* [Episcopis] *agebatur; Qui possunt aliorum Collegarum, & præsertim Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum, judicio causam suam integram*

|Conc. *Melevit.* c. 22.
† Ep. 162.

gram reſervare. Upon which paſſage, joined with ſome other Reaſons, ſome || have contended, that the Acts, and Epiſtles of the 6th. Council of *Carthage* to the Pope, quarrelling about Appeals, are forged and counterfeit: These Acts arguing juſt contrary to S. *Auſtin*, thus; — *If an Appeal not permitted to inferior Clergy, much leſs to Biſhops.* † — *Etſi* (ſay they) *de inferioribus Clericis, vel Laicis videtur ibi,* [in the *Nicene* Canon], *præcaveri, quantò magis de Epiſcopis voluit obſervari?* &c. And Dr. *Field*, touching this matter, hath theſe words || — *The Africans, though within the Patriarchſhip of* Rome, *diſliked the Appeal of their Biſhops to* Rome, *becauſe they might have right againſt their Metropolitans in a General Synod of Affrick, wherein the Primate ſate, as Preſident. For, otherwiſe, Biſhops wronged by their Metropolitans, might, by the Canons, appeal to their own Patriarch.* Thus he. *For otherwiſe*, here meaneth he not; when ſuch Councils do not ſit? (For, ſurely, he would not have a Provincial Council purpoſely new called upon every perſonal contention): But this overthrows the arguments of the *African* Biſhops; who alſo are ſaid to have denied ſuch Appeals, not when *African* Councils ſit only, but altogether. Again, S. *Auſtin* clearly juſtifies Appeals from *African* Councils alſo. This of the *African* Conttoverſie about Appeals, of as little advantage to non-Appealants, as it is of great noiſe, if the matter be, on both ſides, equally weighed.

|| See *Ant. Capellus de Apoſtolationibus, c. 4.*

† *Epiſt. Celeſt.*

‖ *Of the Church, p. 563.*

§. 13. n. 3. Again, Touching another ancient Conteſt, that happened, (and is alſo urged by Proteſtants) between the *Cyprian* Biſhops, and the Patriarch of *Antioch*, decided in the 3d. General Council. Can. 8. you may obſerve: That, whatever priviledge, or exemption, any Church, or Province may have had, from any Patriarch or his Council, as to *Elections*, or *Ordinations*; yet no Church, or Perſon, hath been freed from a ſubmittance thereto, in point of *Appeals*; or of *Deciſion* of *Controverſies* in matter of Faith. Neither here can the *Cyprian* Biſhops by vertue of any ſuch Canon of *Epheſus* plead their particular exemption from the 7th. Canon of *Sardica*, or 9th. of *Chalcedon*, (which Canon is alſo ſeconded by the Imperial Law, in *Cod. Tit. 4. c. 29.*) or from the 17th, or 26th. Canon of the 8th. General Council; which Canons command ſuch ſubmittance, and allow ſuch Appeals; in which Appeals alſo the Inferior Patriarchs were ſubject to the Superior (See before §. 12, 13, and below, the Conceſſion of Dr. *Field*, §. 16. n. 5); And of the Juriſdiction of the *Antiochian* Patriarch over *Cyprus*, as to theſe

theſe matters ſtill remaining after the Canon of *Epheſus*, ſee S. *Jerom* || in his controverſie with *John*, Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*—*Ni fallor, hoc ibi* [i. e. in Concilio Niceno], *ut* Paleſtinæ *Metropolis* Cæſarea *ſit*; *& totius Orientis*, Antiochia. *Aut igitur ad Cæſarienſem Archiepiſcopum referre debueras, cui, ſpretâ communione tuâ, communicare nos noveras; aut, ſi procul expetendum judicium erat,* Antiochiam *potiùs literæ dirigenda.* [*Totius Orientis*; and ſo, *Cypri.*]

|| *Epiſt. ad* Pamachium.

Mean while, in this neceſſary Subordination of the lower Clergy, or their Synods, to the higher,

§. 14.

1. 1ſt. Care was taken; That *Co-ordinate* Churches, or Provinces, or their Synods, (*i. e.* ſuch, whereof the one could claim no Juriſdiction over the other, neither by Ancient Cuſtom, nor Conciliar Conſtitution), ſhould uſurp *no authority* over one another: For which, ſee *Can. Apoſtol.* 36.—*Conc. Nicen. c.* 6.—*Conc. Epheſ. c.* 8.—*Conc. Conſtantinop. c.* 2, 3, 5. Compared with *Conc. Chalced. Act* 16. Which Canons, and particularly the ſecond and third of the Second General Council at *Conſtantinop.* do not prove, what ſome would infer; That all *Provinces* are, for all power, *abſolute*, *ſupreme*, and *independent*, from whom might be no further appeal; nor any other Perſon or Council, as Superior, take account of their Acts; for the contrary known practice in antiquity ſhews this to be otherwiſe †: and thus, *Provincial* Councils would have no ſubjection to *General*; but only ſignifie theſe two things; † See §. 12, 13.

1. 1ſt. That neither Patriarch, nor Primate, or Metropolitan, ſhould meddle in the affairs of any other Patriarchy, or Province, *co-ordinate*, and over which he had no Juriſdiction in ſuch affairs: (*i. e.*) over which, neither by ancient cuſtom, nor conſtitutions of Councils, he could claim any ſuch ſuperiority. (See the limitation, *Conc. Epheſ. c.* 8.—*Quæ non priùs, atq; ab initio*, &c. And *Can. Apoſtol.* 36.—*Quæ illi nullo jure ſubjectæ ſunt*; a clauſe, that is ſtill retained in theſe Canons to preſerve the prerogatives Patriarchal: As for example, Not the Biſhops of *Alexandria* therefore to meddle with the affairs of *Antioch*—*Solius Ægypti curam gerant, ſervatis honoribus Eccleſiæ Antiochenæ.* Servatis, *i. e.* without encroaching upon them: Nor the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, or *Antioch*, to meddle with the Ordination of the Biſhops in the ſeveral Provinces ſubjected to them: Nor thoſe of *Aſia* with thoſe of *Thrace*; to whom *Thrace* owed no ſubjection.

2. 2ly. That, in every Province, the Provincial Synod be the *Supreme*, and *laſt*, Court, above any other authority *in that Province*; and excluſively to the judgment of the Biſhops of any neigh-

bouring Provinces, which are only co-ordinate with it. (See them below §. 28. called by *Gregory*, *Episcopi alieni Concilii*). For observe, that some of those Dioceſſes that are urged, in the former Canon || to be independent, *viz.* the Dioceſs of *Thrace*, *Pontus*, and *Asia*, are, in the 16th Act of the Council *Chalced.* where this very Canon was recited, mentioned to be subjected to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*; *ſubjected*; *i. e.* as to confirmation of their Metropolitans, and as to Appeals, ſee *Conc. Chalced.* Can. 9. & 16. Though ſtill their priviledge ſtood firm—*Ut Epiſcopi* Thraciæ *gubernent quæ* Thraciæ; namely, *unuſquiſq; Metropolita præfatarum Dioceſium ordinet ſua Regionis Epiſcopos, ſicut Divinis Canonibus* [(*i. e.*) the Canons of *Nice*, and theſe of *Conſtantinople*] *eſt præceptum*. And, as theſe Dioceſſes were ſubject to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*; ſo were others to thoſe of *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*.

|| *Conc. Epheſ. c.* 8.

§. 15. n. 1. 2.

The ſecond neceſſary proviſion made by the Church, was, That in the Intervals of Synods, the reſpective *Preſidents* thereof ſhould be authorized, as ſtanding Church-Officers, always extant, and acceſſible, to end controverſies, interpret, and execute their Canons; ſince theſe greater Bodies could not be, ſo frequently as occaſions might require, without much trouble, aſſembled †.

† See, below, §. 16. n. 6, & 8.

As alſo leſſer cauſes were ordered to be finally terminated in ſome inferior Court, without liberty of appeal, in *all* Cauſes, by *whatever* perſons, (which was the chief matter ſtood upon by the *Africans* againſt Pope *Boniface*, in the caſe of a Presbyter) from one ſuperior Court to a further; or alſo, from the ſtanding Eccleſiaſtical Officers, to a future Council; that ſo Contentions might not be unneceſſarily prolonged; nor the ſupreme Courts overcharged with buſineſs; nor Juſtice deferred. See *Conc. Milevit. c.* 22. And Card. *Bellarmin. De Rom. Pontif. l.* 2. *c.* 24.—*Quæſtio de Appellationibus ad Romanum Pontificem non eſt de appellationibus Presbyterorum, & minorum Clericorum, ſed de appellationibus Epiſcoporum*, &c. See, below, §. 16. n. 6, 8.

This in the third place (from §. 12.) of the Churches *ſubjecting* both Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, and Councils, *One* to *Another*, the leſs to the greater, in point of Judicature and Authority, for preventing of *Schiſmes*.

IV. §. 15. n. 2.

4ly. When the two Eccleſiaſtical Courts, or Officers, that are ſubordinate, do diſſent, the obedience of the *Subjects* of *both*, in ſuch caſe being once apparent, was to be rendred to the *Superior*. So, if a Dioceſan, or Provincial, Council ought to yield

to

to a National, the Subjects of ſuch *Province*, or *Dioceſs*, when theſe two Councils claſh, ought to conform, in their Obedience, to the *National*, not to a Dioceſan, or Provincial, Council, againſt it.

§. 16. n. 1.

Now, for ſuch a ſubordination of the ſeveral Church-Officers, and Synods forenamed; and for Obedience, when theſe diſſent, due to the Superior; (the two points laſt mentioned). I will, to ſave the labour of further proof, give you the *Conceſſions* of Learned *Proteſtants*, (though this be done with ſome limitations, accomodated to the better legitimating of their Reformation; of which limitations, ſee below, §. 16. n. 4.— & n. 7. and again, §. 28.); deſiring you alſo to peruſe thoſe ſet down already to the ſame purpoſe, in the ſecond Diſcourſe. §. 24. n. 1. *&c.*

Of this matter, then, thus Dr. *Ferne*. in the Caſe between the Church of *England*, and *Rome*, p. 48.—*The Church of Chriſt is a ſociety, or company, under a Regiment, Diſcipline, Government; and the Members, conſtituting that Society, are either Perſons taught, guided, governed, or Perſons teaching, guiding, governing; and this, in order to preſerve all in unity, and to advance every Member of this viſible Society, to an effectual, and real participation of Grace, and Union with Chriſt the Head; and therefore, and upon no leſs account, is obedience due unto them*, Eph. 4. 11, 12, 13, 16. *and*, Heb. 13. 17. *And he, that will not hear the Church, is to be as a Heathen, and a Publican*, Mat. 16. And, ſapplying this to the *Presbyterians*, and other Sects, dividing from the Engliſh Biſhops, and Synods ||—*They have incurred* (ſaith he) *by leaving us (and I wiſh they would ſadly conſider it) no leſs, than the guilt of Schiſme; which lies heavily on as many, as have (of what perſwaſion, or Sect, ſoever) wilfully divided themſelves from the communion of the Church of* England; *whether they do this by a bare ſeparation; or by adding violence, and Sacrilcdge unto it.*

|| p. 46.

And thus Dr. *Hammond*, ſomewhat more diſtinctly in his Book of Schiſm, *c.* 8. *p.* 157. —*The way* (ſaith he) *provided by Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, for preſerving the Unity of the Faith, &c. in the Church, is fully acknowledged by us*—*made up of two Acts of Apoſtolical Providence*; 1ſt. *Their reſolving, &c.* 2. *Their eſtabliſhing an excellent ſubordination of all inferior Officers of the Church to the Biſhops in every City; of the Biſhops in every Province to their Metropolitans; of the Metropolitans in every Region or Diocaeſis, to Patriarchs, or Primates;*

§. 16. n. 2.

mates; allowing also, among these, such a primacy of Order, or Dignity, as might be proportionable to the πρῶτος Σίμων in Scripture and agreeable to what is, by the ancient Canons, allowed to the Bishop of Rome, *and this standing subordination sufficient for all ordinary uses. And when there should be need of extraordinary remedies, there was, then, a supply to be had by congregating Councils Provincial, Patriarchal, General.* Again, *Ib. c.* 3. he declares Schism in withdrawing obedience from any of these; beginning at the lowest, and so ascending to the highest — *Those Brethren, or People* (saith he ||) *which reject the Ministry of the Deacons, or Presbyters, in any thing wherein they are ordained, or appointed by the Bishop, (and as long as they continue in obedience to him); and of their own accord break off, and separate from them, refuse to live regularly under them, they are, by the ancient Church of Christ, adjudged, and looked on as Schismaticks* — † *In like manner; if we ascend to the next higher Link; that of the Bishop, to whom both Presbyters, and Deacons, as well as the Brethren, or People, are obliged to live in obedience, the withdrawing, or denying this obedience, in any of these, will certainly fall under this guilt.*

|| §. 7.

† §. 8.

§. 16. n. 3. Next, For the higher Ranks of Church-Prelates, §. 20. he goes on thus — *It is manifest, That as the several Bishops had prefecture over their several Churches, and over the Presbyters, Deacons, and People, under them, such as could not be cast off by any, without the guilt, and brand of Schisme; so the Bishops themselves of the ordinary inferior Cities (for the preserving of unity, and many other good uses), were subjected to the higher power of Archbishops or Metropolitans* [he having shewed, in §. 11, 12, the first Institution thereof Apostolical, in *Titus*, and *Timothy*] *nay, we must yet ascend* (saith he) *one degree higher: from this of Archbishops, or Metropolitans, to that supreme of Primates or Patriarchs,* [Concerning whose authority, having produced several Canons of Councils, §. 25. he concludes thus] — *All these Canons, or Councils, deduce this power of Primates over their own Bishops, from the Apostles, and first Planters of the Churches; wherein that which is pertinent to this place is only this; that there may be a disobedience, and irregularity, and so, a* Schism, *even in the Bishops in respect of their Metropolitans, and of the authority, which these have by Canon, and Primitive Custom, over them.* And the obedience due to these several ranks of Ecclesiastical Superiors, he affirms also due, on the same account, to their several Synods † — *It is evident* (saith he), *That the power, which severally belongs to the Bishops is united in that of a Council, where these Bishops are assembled; and the despising of that* [Council]

† *Answ. to Catholick Gent. c.* 3. *p.* 29.

[Council] *is an offence under the first sort of Schism—and a despising of all ranks of our Ecclesiastical Superiors, whereof it is compounded.* Thus Dr. *Hammond*: ascending in these subordinations as high, as Primates.

But Dr. *Field*, Bishop *Bramhal*, and others, rise one step higher, to the *Proto-primates*, or *Patriarchs*, κατ' ἐξοχην so called, and their Councils. And strange it is (if it were not from an engagement to the present *English* Interest) that Dr. *Hammond* could pass by these, in his speaking of the remedies of Schism, with so much silence, (not mentioning *Patriarchs*, but only as taken for *Primates*; or their Councils. See * Answ. to Cathol. Gent. *c.* 3. n. 9, 10, 11. Where he speaks of the authority of Provincial, National, Oecumenical, Councils, but passeth by *Patriarchal*; and, * *Schism*, p. 158. where he names Provincial, Patriarchal, General, but useth *Patriarchal* there for *National*, or the Council presided-in by the Primate, to which Primate sometimes was applied the name of Patriarch) *Strange*, I say, considering not only the clear evidence of ancient Constitutions, and practice, relating to these Patriarchs, and their Synods; but the great necessity thereof, as to the *Unity* of the Churches *Faith*, and Conservation of her *Peace*; and that much more, since the division of the Empire into so many Kingdoms; by reason of which secular contrary Interests, the several parts, and members of the Catholick Church, dispersed amongst them, are more subject to be disjointed, and separated, from one another. Which unity and peace, (if we reflect on * the great rarity of General Councils (not above 5, or 6, in the Protestant account, in 1600. years) and * the multiplicity of Primates that are in Christendom, all left by Dr. *Hammond* Supreme, and independent, of one another; or of any other person, or Council, when a General one not in being; and * the experience of their frequent Lapses into gross Errors: (For almost what great *Heresie*, or *Schism*, hath there been in the Church, whereof some *Primate* was not a chief Abettor); and * The Rents in the Church, made by these, apt to be much greater, as the person is higher, and more powerful), is not sufficiently provided for, though much pretended, in Dr. *Hammonds* Scheme. §. 16. n. 4.

Come we then to Dr. *Fields* Model yet more enlarged—*The actions* (saith he ||) *of the Bishop of each particular Church of a City, and places adjoining, were subject to the censure, and judgment of the rest* §. 16. n. 5. || *Of the Chur.* p. 513.

reſt of the Biſhops of the ſame Province; amongſt whom, for order ſake, there was one Chief; to whom it pertained to call them together, to ſit as Moderator in the midſt of them, being aſſembled; and to execute what by joint conſent they reſolved on. The actions of the Biſhops of a Province, and of a Provincial Synod conſiſting of theſe Biſhops, were ſubject to a Synod conſiſting of the Metropolitans, and other Biſhops of divers Provinces. This Synod was of two ſorts. For either it conſiſted of the Metropolitans, and Biſhops of one Kingdom, and Nation only, as did the Councils of Affrica; *or of the Metropolitans, and Biſhops of many Kingdoms. If of the Metropolitans, and Biſhops of one Kingdom, and State only, the chief Primate was Moderator: If of many, one of the* Patriarchs, *and chief Biſhop of the whole world* [was Moderator]: *every Church being ſubordinate to ſome one of of the* Patriarchal *Churches, and incorporate into the Unity of it.* Here you ſee that roundly confeſt, which Dr. *Hammond* conceal'd, Again, *Ib.* p. 668.—*It is evident, That there is a power in Biſhops, Metropolitans, Primates, and Patriarchs, to call Epiſcopal, Provincial, National and Patriarchal Synods;* [Synods Patriarchal anſwering to Patriarchs: National to Primates] *and that neither ſo depending of, nor ſubject to, the power of Princes; but that, when they are enemies to the Faith, they may exerciſe the ſame without their conſent, and privity, and ſubject them, that refuſe to obey their Summons, to ſuch puniſhments, as the Canons of the Church do preſcribe in caſes of ſuch contempt, or wilful negligence.*—And, *Ib.* p. 557.—*That the Decrees of Popes, made with the conſent, and joint concurrence of the other Weſtern Biſhops, did bind the Weſtern Provinces, that were ſubject to him, as Patriarch of the Weſt.* Bind them ſo, as that theſe had no liberty to *contradict* the judgment of the Patriarch, and this Council: for which ſee *Ib. c.* 39. *p.* 563. where he quotes the Emperors Law, (*Novel.* 123. *c.* 22. —*Patriarcha Dioceſeos illius huic cauſæ præbeat finem, nullâ parte ejus ſententiæ* contradicere *valente*), confirming the 9th. Canon of *Conc. Chalced.* Again, *p.* 567, 568. he ſaith—*That it is a Rule in Church-government; that the leſſer, and inferior, may not judge the greater, and ſuperior.*—*That, if any Biſhop have ought againſt his Metropolitan, he muſt go (as I ſhewed before) to the Patriarch, and his Synod, to complain; as to fit, and competent Judges.*—*That the great Patriarchs of the Chriſtian Church are to be judged by ſome other of their own rank in order before them, aſſiſted by inferior Biſhops; that the Biſhop of* Rome, *as firſt in order among the Patriarchs, aſſiſted with his own Biſhops, and the Biſhops of him, that is thought faulty,* [though theſe later are not found always neceſſary, or preſent at ſuch judgments; nor, more of his own Biſhops, than

than those whom he can at such time conveniently assemble, and consult with, as appears in the Appeals of those persons named before, §. 13. n. 1.] *may judge any of the other Patriarchs; That such as have complaints against them, may fly to him, and the Synod of Bishops subject to him, and that the Patriarchs themselves, in their distresses, may fly to him, and such Synods, for relief, and help.* (See the same, *p* 668) Nor doth he acknowledge such an authority of Judicature in these Church-Prelates, only as joined w th their Synods, but also in them single, and without them. For, since it is manifest; that the constant meeting of the *Provincial* Synods *twice*, as it was ordered at the first, or *once*, in the year, as afterward, did very early cease, either by the Clergies neglect, or the great trouble, and charge of such Assemblies, and so later Councils accordingly appointed such Synods to be held in stead of twice yearly, once in 3. years (nor yet are in this well obeyed), Hence either all such Causes, and Appeals to their Superiors (still multiplied, as Christianity is increased,) must be for so long a time suspended, and depending, which would be intolerable; and a quick dispatch, though less equitable, rather to be wished; or, the hearing of them must be devolved to these single standing Judges, as directed by former Church-Canons. Concerning this therefore thus the same Doctor goes on, || quoting the Canons of the 6th. and 7th. Council. —*At the first* (saith he *there was a Synod of Bishops in every Province, twice in the year: But for the misery, and poverty of such, as should travel to Synods, the Fathers of the* 6th. *Council* † *decreed it should be once in the year; and then things amiss to be redressed, which Canon was renewed by the* 7th. *General Council* ||: *But afterwards, many things falling out to hinder their happy Meetings, we shall find; that they met not so often* [and very early may this be found] *and therefore the Council of* Basil *appointed Episcopal Synods to be holden once every year, and Provincial at the least once in three years: And so, in time, Causes growing many, and the difficulties intolerable, in coming together, and in staying, to hear these Causes thus multiplied, and increased, it was thought fitter to refer the hearing of complaints, and appeals, to Metropolitans, and such like Ecclesiastical Judges, limited, and directed by Canons, and Imperial Laws, than to trouble the Pastors of whole Provinces, and to wrong the people by the absence of their Pastors, and Guides.* Thus He. And, if this rarer meeting of *Provincial* Synods transferred many Causes on the *Metropolitans* sole Judicature, much more did that rarer assembling of a *Patriarchal*, or *General*, Council, leave appeals in greater Causes to the single Arbitrement of

§. 16. n. 6.

|| l. 5. p. 514.

† Can. 8.

|| Can. 6.

§. 16. n. 7. Here, then, you see, in Dr. *Field*, the ground of a thorow Union in Christs Church: whereas that of Dr. *Ferne*, and Dr *Hamond*, though it served their turn for the remedy of a *Presbyterian* defection, or the extravagancies of some particular Bishop, yet afforded no standing cure (as it did concern them, it should not,) for those of a *Primate*, or for any *National* Division. Only one Reservation Dr. *Field* hath in this place, perhaps with an eye to protect the Reformation thereby, which Dr. *Hamond*, I conceive, thought it not safe to trust to—*That the Bishops of a Province, subject to a Metropolitan, or the Metropolitan, and his Bishops, subject to a Patriarch, may declare in what cases he incurreth the sentence of Suspension, Excommunication, Deposition, or Degradation, pronounced by the very Law, and Canon it self; and so may withdraw themselves from his Obedience.* Thus he. Where, suppose this, he would have, should be granted him, concerning a *General Council*, all of it *united*, and declaring such a thing (if such a thing may be) of the *Supreme Prelate* of the Church, and President of this Council, because there is no Superior Person, or Court of Judicature, whereby this President may be tried: And also granted, concerning such proceeding against any *Subordinate* Superior, (as against the *Metropolitan*, or *Primate*) whenever he *freely confesseth* that transgression of the Canons, which they charge him with; for, in such a case, their obedience is due not to him any longer, but to the Canons, and to his Superiors, that maintain them. But, most presumptuous, and unreasonable it seems, for *Subjects* to make any such Declaration, and withdraw Obedience, whenever such matter is in contest between them and him; and a superior person, or Court, provided to decide it; and yet more unreasonable, if a part only of the Subjects, suppose, of a Primate, or Patriarch, should declare so, when another part withstands them, and declares the contrary. And see *Can.* 10. of the 8. General Council punctual against any such Delaration, or Discession, before a Judgment—*Nullus Clericus, ante Synodicam Sententiam, à communione proprii Patriarchæ se separet*, &c. *Idem de Episcopis statuimus, erga proprios Metropolitanos; similiter & de Metropolitis, circa Patriarchum suum.* This of Dr. *Field*. See the places quoted out of B. *Bramhal* to the same purpose, *Disc.* 2. §. 24. n. 1. —And *Disc.* 1. §. 27.

§. 16. n. 8. The like is acknowledged at large, by the Archbishop of *Spalato*; and amongst these Patriarchs, the supereminent Privi-
ledges

ledges of the first, or Roman, Patriarch, (the evidences of Antiquity producing such a consent in these Learned men) are displayed by him, in his *Repub. Eccles. l.* 3, *c.* 2, & 10. There, *c.* 2, *n.* 1. having named the other lower subordinations of Church-Governors, *ad vitanda Schismata*; he goes on — *Ac demum & Primatibus, & Metropolitanis, & Episcopis unus Patriarcha in totâ integrâ aliquâ Provinciâ, in certis similiter causis, praesideret — Et quia non semper adeo facile est Episcopos comprovinciales* [or *compatriarchales* much more] *in unum convenire, expedient fuit, ut Metropolitani, & Primates* [& Patriarchæ] *multa, soli, absolverent, quæ Synodi absolvere debuissent; essentq; quasi totius Synodi Vicarii & Commissarii* Further of these Patriarchs he saith || — *Sicut Metropolitanus Episcopus suffraganeos suos errantes corripere, & corrigere debeat, & emendare; ita, si Metropolitanus erret, , sive in moribus, sive in judiciis, & actis suis, ne etiam in hoc Synodus etiam semper, cum incommodo, conveniat, à Patriarchis voluit Ecclesiastica consuetudo, & lex, Metropolitanos emendari; nisi tam gravis sit causa, & publica, praesertim fidei, ut totius regionis Synodus, sive & Oecumenica, debeat convenire*: Quoting the words of the 8. General Council, Can. 17. saying the same — *Senioris & novæ* Romæ *Praesules, &c. Metropolitanorum habeant potestatem, ad convocandum eos* [not this in times of Heathenism, but when Christian Religion flourished under secular Princes, already subjected to it], *urgente necessitate, ad Synodalem conventum, vel etiam ad coercendum illos, & corrigendum, cum fama eos, super quibusdam delictis, forsan accusaverit.* Further, ascending to the Roman Patriarch, he thus goes on to declare his privledges || — *Habebat etiam Romanus Pontifex Patriarchalia privilegia, pallium, sibi subjectis Metropolitanis illud petentibus, concedere, &c; eosdem à lege divina, vel sacris Canonibus, deviantes corripere, & in officio continere; controversias inter eosdem exortas componere, causasq; eorundem interdum* [(*i. e.*) in causis gravioribus] *audire, & decidere; totius Patriarchatus Concilia convocare* — n. 14. — *Ex loco sui primi Patriarchatus, Sacrorum Canonum primus habebatur, & præcipuus, observator, custos, ac vindex; quos si alicubi violari cognosceret, acer monitor insurgebat.* n. 15. — *Ad ipsum quicunq; Episcopi cujuscunq; provinciæ, & regionis,* [not only of his Patriarchy] *qui se ab Episcopis propriæ provinciæ gravari sentirent, & in judiciis Ecclesiasticis tanquam ad sacram anchoram, confugerent apud ipsum innocentiam suam probaturi* — *Romani Pontifices de facto eos sedibus suis restituebant, & ab objectis criminibus, tanquam si essent supremi judices, absolvebant* [and this so anciently as *Cyprians* time, and before the first General Council of *Nice*] n. 16. — *Ille, propter summam ipsius existimationem, commune quasi vinculum, & nodus erat præcipuus Catholi-*

|| *l.* 3. *c.* 10. *n.* 26.

|| *l.* 4. *c.* 9. *n.* 1.

ca Communionis in tota Eccleſiâ.—Catholica Communionis dux, & arbiter, ut cui ipſe ſuam communionem vel daret, vel adimeret, cætera quaq; Eccleſiæ omnes ordinariè darent pariter, vel adimerent. So *Spalatenſis.*

§. 16. n. 9.

Mr. *Thorndike*, firſt in general, ſaith † — *That the Soul of the* Viſible Unity *of the* Church, *conſiſteth in the reſort of inferior Churches to ſuperior* [of which he diſcourſeth more largely, in Right of the Church, *c.* 2] *and in the correſpondence of* Parallel-Churches. —*That the Church, ſo ſtated is a ſtanding Synod, able, by conſent of the chief Churches containing the conſent of their reſorts,* [*i. e.* of the inferior Churches reſorting to them] *to conclude the whole.* —*That* Rome, Alexandria, Antiochia, *were from the beginning of Chriſtianity, viſible Heads of theſe great Reſorts in Church Government*; *which the Council of* Nice *made ſubject to them, by Canon-Law, for the future* ||, *our Britiſh Church not excepted* †. And, more particularly, in juſtifying the Authority of the Roman Patriarch, and the Canons of *Sardica*, concerning Appeals to him. —*Shall I not ask* (ſaith he) *what pretence there could be to ſettle from other parts Appeals to* Rome, *rather than from* Rome *to other parts, had not a preeminence of power, and not only a precedence of Rank been acknowledged originally in the Church of* Rome? And, before, ſpeaking of the Eaſtern *Arrians* deſiring to be heard at *Rome*, by *Julius*: —*Shall I believe* (ſaith he) *as ſome Learned men* [*i. e.* Proteſtants] *conjecture*; *That Pope* Julius *is meerly an Arbitrator, named by one party, whom the other could not refuſe*; *and that any Biſhop, or at leaſt any Primate, might have been named, and muſt have been admitted, as well as he? Truly I cannot.* Thus Mr. *Thorndike*. I fear I have tired you with the ſame things ſo often repeated by ſeveral Authors, but this may ſerve the more to confirm the verity of that, wherein they agree. As for the *Obedience* acknowledged by them due to the *Church*, according to theſe *Subordinations*, I ſhall have occaſion to give you a further account of it hereafter.

† *Juſt weights*, p. 41.

|| p. 39.

† p. 40.

§. 17. Now this Subordination, not only of the lower Ranks of Clergy, *Presbyters*, and *Biſhops*, of the ſame, but of theſe higher, *Primates*, and *Patriarchs*, of ſeveral Nations, ending its aſcent in a Primacy, not of order (ineffective), but alſo of Power, placed in the Prime Patriarch, eſpecially conduceth to the neceſſary coherence of the always *one-only-Communion* of the Church *Catholick National*, and to the ſuppreſſion of Hereſies, and Schiſmes, oftner than *Dioceſan* only, or *Provincial*.

§. 18. A thing, which the moderate ſpirit of *Grotius* well obſerved,

ed, and ſpared not often to ſpeak of—*Quæ verò eſt cauſa,* (ſaith he in his firſt Reply to *Rivet* ||) *cur, qui opinionibus diſſident inter Catholicos, maneant in eodem corpore, non ruptâ Communione; contrà, qui inter Proteſtantes diſſident, idem facere nequeant, utcunq; multa de dilectione fraternâ loquuntur? Hoc qui rectè expenderit, inveniet, quanta ſit vis Primatus.* [which brings to mind that of S. *Jerom* †, concerning S. *Peters* Primacy—*Propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut, capite conſtituto, Schiſmatum tollatur occaſio. Capite conſtituto*; but Primacy of *Order*, without power, helps no ſchiſms.] And again, the ſame *Grotius* in the cloſe of the laſt Reply to *Rivet* || written not long before his death—*Reſtitutionem Chriſtianorum in unum idemq; Corpus, ſemper optatam à* Grotio, *ſciunt, qui eum norunt. Exiſtimavit autem aliquando, incipi poſſe à Proteſtantium inter ſe conjunctione. Poſtea vidit, id planè fieri nequire; quia, præterquam quod Calviniſtarum ingenia fermè omnium ab omni pace ſunt alieniſſima, Proteſtantes nullo inter ſe communi eccleſiaſtico regimine ſociantur; quæ cauſæ ſunt, cur ſactæ partes in unum Proteſtantium corpus colligi nequeant; immo & cur partes aliæ atq; aliæ ſint exſurrecturæ. Quare nunc planè ita ſentit* Grotius, *& multi cum ipſo, non poſſe Proteſtantes inter ſe jungi, niſi ſimul jungantur cum iis, qui Sedi Romanæ cohærent; ſine quâ nullum ſperari poteſt in Eccleſia commune Regimen: Ideo optat, ut ea divulſio, quæ evenit, & cauſæ divulſionis tollantur. Inter eas cauſas non eſt Primatus Epiſcopi Romani ſecundum Canonas, fatente* Melanchone; *qui eum Primatum etiam neceſſarium putat ad retinendam unitatem.* Thus *Grotius.* Which paſſages is taken notice of by Dr. *Hammond*, in *Schiſm*, p. 158, and ſeemingly allowed: the Doctor, there ſeeming to admit the Popes authority ſo far, as it is juſtifiable by the ancient Canons; which authority, you have ſeen how far it is, by other Proteſtants, out of the ſame Canons, advanced. And indeed, to exclude this *ſupreme Patriarchal* authority, and conſtitute ſuch an Ariſtocratical, or rather, ſo many ſeveral Monarchical, abſolute, equal, independent, Governments (in regard of any ſpiritual Superior) as there are *Primates*, (*ſeveral Monarchical Governments*, I ſay; for the *Ariſtocratical* Government conſiſts in one Council or Court, having its conſtant, and ſet Meetings, ſuch as are not thoſe Meetings of the Higheſt Eccleſiaſtical Synods, and therefore they cannot bear this Stile) ſeems moſt deſtructive of the Churches *Unity*, and *Peace*; And then, to make amends for this, the ſubjecting all theſe diſtinct Monarchical Governments to a *General Council*, proves no ſufficient Remedy; when we reflect, how many and frequent are Clergy-differences; how few ſuch Councils have hitherto

|| *Ad Art.* 7.

† *Adverſus Jovin. l.* 1. *c.* 14.

|| *Apol. Diſcuſſio*, p. 255. § 19.

therto been; how difficult such a Council, since the Division of the Empire, to be convened; or rather, how impossible, according to the Protestants Composition of it; who, as they frequently appeal to it; so load it with such conditions, as they may be sure, such Court can never meet to hear their Cause. Thus much is contributed by Learned *Protestants* toward the confirmation of the two last, the 3d. and 4th. *Constitutions.* vid. p. 13.

V. §. 20. 5ly. After such a *Regular*, and *well-compacted* Government, thus setled in the Church. Next, it was strictly ordered, by the Church-Laws, and by her greatest Censures imposed on Delinquents; That no *Clergy*, in any matters of *meerly Spiritual* Concernment, should decline the Authority, or Judgment, of these their Ecclesiastical Superiors, or their subjection to the Church-Canons; by repairing, or appealing, to any *secular* Tribunal; (from which Tribunals some in those days sought relief); either that of other inferior Lay Magistrates, or, of the Emperor himself; Nor should seek new Ecclesiastical Dignities erected by the Emperors *Pragmatick*, contrary to the Canons. Decreed also it was; That, in such case, any Church-authority, or priviledges, attempted to be so alienated, should still continue to the former Possessors. For which, see *Conc. Antioch. c.* 11, 12. —*Conc. Sardic. c.* 8.—*Conc. Chalced. c.* 9, & 12. —*Conc. Milevit. c.* 19. —*Conc. Tolet.* 3, *c.* 13. —8 *Gen. Conc. c.* 17, & 21.

§. 21. Which *Ecclesiastical* Constitutions, that they may appear no way unjust; or infringing the Rights of *Temporal* Soveraignty; It is to be noted, (and therefore give me leave to spend a few lines in the Illustration of it, because it seems very pertinent to the matter in hand); That the *Church*, from the beginning, was constituted by our Lord, a distinct Body from the *Civil* State: and is, in all such States, but one visible Society, (*Credo unam Catholicam Ecclesiam*); all the parts of it having one, and the same interest, through those several Dominions; and regulated, within these Territories, by its own Laws (without which Laws no Communion can consist) independently, as to matters *purely spiritual*, on the State; and the exercise of these not lawfully to be inhibited, or altered by it; whilst all the Civil Rights of such States, mean while, do remain unviolated by these Church-Laws; and the secular Sword is left, where it was before, in the hand of the Secular Governors; so that, the Church, in any difference, cannot be the *invading*, but only the *suffering*, party.

§. 22. Now, if you would know more particularly, what those *Rights*

Rights are, which the Church hath, from the begining, practiſed, and vindicated, as belonging to her independently, and notwithſtanding any oppoſition, of the Secular Powers, Theſe are ſome, if not the chief of them: * Namely, The entrance of theſe *Miniſters of Chriſt*, without Arms, into whatever Princes Dominions; and their preaching there the Goſpel of Chriſt, and adminiſtring the Sacraments to his Subjects, though againſt his *Prohibition*. * *Determining Controverſies* ariſing in matters of Faith, and Religion; and *publiſhing* ſuch their Determinations to all the Churches Subjects within any Princes Realms. * Making *Eccleſiaſtical Laws* for Government, and Diſcipline, as need requires. * Receiving *Accuſations*, examining *Witneſſes*, correcting *Offenders*, againſt the Laws of Chriſt, or of the Church: [I do not name here, the Churches judging of *Civil* Cauſes between Chriſtians, (though this a thing moſt uſual, when the Princes, and their Courts were Heathen); becauſe this is a Right of the Prince to judge all ſuch Cauſes, when brought before him: and, on that account, the practice thereof did return to the Prince, when Chriſtian; when it had been diſuſed before, only becauſe Chriſtians, in any conteſt, choſe rather, or alſo were enjoined, (it being a thing not only lawful, but in thoſe times, very expedient, for them) to ſtand to the Arbitration of their Eccleſiaſtical Governors, than to go to the trial of the Civil Law, and Secular Magiſtrate.] * Declaring *Hereſie*; *Suſpending* criminous ſinners from the *Sacrament*: Impoſing *Penances*; Reconciling Penitents; and *Excommunicating*, and caſting out of the Church the incorrigible, and obſtinate: * *Ordaining Church-Officers* in a due Subordination, with a ſtrict dependance of the lower, upon the higher, Clergy; ſo that an Eccleſiaſtical Function is unlawfully exerciſed by the one, if he enter upon it without the conſent, or confirmation, of the other; (and that, not only of Presbyters without the Biſhops; and of Biſhops, without the Metropolitans, or Primates; but of *Primates* themſelves alſo, without the *Patriarchs*: (as hath been ſhewed). * Holding Religious Aſſemblies, both for the *Publick Service* of God, and for the forementioned *Church-Affairs*. * And, for this again, the reſpective Superiors *Calling*, and appointing theſe Meetings in certain places, and times; which alſo muſt be within the Territories of ſome ſecular Prince: only all theſe things done by *Lawful*, and *Canonical*, Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, without *Arms* (unleſs it be thoſe of the Prince for their protection) and in order to ends *purely ſpiritual*. In which proceedings therefore they remain queſtionable, and to be reſtrained by the ſame Temporal

Aus-

Authority, when, in any exceeding of ſuch limits, found to tranſgreſs.

§. 23. All theſe things were practiſed by the Church in the Apoſtles times, (See for ſeveral of them, 1 *Tim.* 5. 19, 20, 21.— *Tit.* 1. 10, 11, 13. —1 *Cor.* 5. 4, 5, 12, 13.— 4. 19, 21.—3 *John* 9. 10.—*Mat.* 18. 17, 18, 20. and their holding a Council at *Jeruſalem*, Act. 15) and in the primitive times, before *Conſtantine*, though the ſecular Powers (as yet Heathen), oppoſed, prohibited, executed, the chief Actors of them; and therefore much more, they may be continued, and acted by the ſame Authority, when *Princes*, for the gaining of eternal Crowns, have ſubjected their mortal ones to Chriſtianity, and are become *Sons* of the *Church*; who, ſurely, by bringing in their perſons under her obedience, do not gain any ſuch new Soveraignty over her, as by this to take away thoſe former Rights, which Heathen Potentates could not juſtly deny, or withhold from her. For note here, That whatever Prerogative, or Priviledge, is challenged by a Chriſtian Prince, as naturally belonging to the *Civil* Power, cannot be denied alſo to an Infidel, or Heathen, Prince, when poſſeſſed of the ſame power; [For example, If a *Chriſtian* Prince may lawfully reſtrain the Biſhops, his Subjects, from meeting in Synods, from executing the Church-Canons, or publiſhing their definitions in matter of Doctrine, (I mean ſuch as no way concern the State) within his Realm, without his leave, upon this account, becauſe he is the Politick Supreme; ſo may a *Heathen*, as having the very ſame Title to do it.] And therefore none ſuch muſt be haſtily challenged by the one, which, if exerciſed by the other, would both have ruined the Government of the Primitive Church, and rendered its ordinary practice guilty of a moſt high Rebellion. If theſe Chriſtian Princes, therefore, now aſſiſt the Church to call her Councils, if they adopt her Canons amongſt their Laws, and uſe their ſecular ſword (much more effective, and dreaded by many, for the preſent, than her Spiritual one) to force their Subjects, and hers, to a more ready obedience to her Laws; we may not therefore argue her former power is now loſt, for calling Councils; or, for executing her Canons, unleſs theſe firſt be made alſo their Laws, becauſe a ſecularly-ſtronger Power is joined with hers, for the more advancing the ſame effect; and hence perhaps, to ſome, may ſeem to eclipſe Hers. But, though, in ſuch a Conjunction, the Princes Authority ſeems to have the ſtronger influence on Church-affairs; yet, ſo often as any ſuch Prince, in Profeſſion, Chriſtian, but addicted to ſome Faction apart, withdraws ſuch aſſiſtance from his true

Mo-

Mother, and leaves Her again, as the Heathen Princes did, deſtitute of his aid, or alſo reſtrained with his Interdicts; ſo often ſhe is forced to renew the Churches former behaviour in the Heathen times; and goes on acting the ſame things ſingly by her ſelf, armed only with that ſword of Juſtice, which Chriſt hath put into her hands, of ſhutting the Rebellious out of the Kingdom of Heaven. Elſe, if we ſuppoſe any one Branch of the former Church-Authority, in ſuch a caſe as this, to be loſt by the Princes being Chriſtian; any Heretical Prince will now have the ſame power to ruine the Orthodox, and Catholick Religion within his Territories, as a Heathen Prince would then have had, to deſtroy the Chriſtian.

§. 24. As you may eaſily diſcern, if you will ſuppoſe ſuch a Prince as *Conſtantius*, one that profeſſeth *Arrianiſme*, to claim, as being a Chriſtian Prince, the exercising of ſome of thoſe Powers forementioned, which were managed by the Church her ſelf before the times of *Conſtantine*. Namely; a Power. To *change* the *Subordinations* of the Eccleſiaſtical Authority, eſtabliſhed by the Church; to *tranſlate Patriarchs*, or erect *new ones*, and to free the *Primates* (ſuch as are *Arrian*) from *obedience* to *Them*, and their *Synods*; to introduce *new* Clergy, or depoſe the former, as to the Function of their Office in any place of his Dominions; when yet theſe no way obnoxious to ſecular Juſtice for tranſgreſſing his Civil Laws (in which caſe, ſhould the Prince deprive any ſuch Clergy of life, or liberty, as *Salomon* did *Abiathar*, yet the Clergy, not the Prince, is to ſupply another): and all this, without their reſpective Eccleſiaſtical Superiors conſent, and allowance.—* To hinder the *Calling* of Eccleſiaſtical Synods, without his Conſent, as a thing rightly appertaining to him, and other Chriſtian Princes, not them, the Church-men.—* Or, theſe called, at leaſt to hinder *his* Clergy from aſſiſting there; and to deny their Decrees obligatory, at leaſt, within the Circuit of his Government.—* When Synods are aſſembled in his own Territories, and with his leave; To hinder their making any definitions, in ſpiritual matters, or, publiſhing them within his Dominions, without their being firſt evidenced to him, to be in nothing repugnant to Gods Word, (a thing he is to learn of them), and without his conſent firſt obtained; whereby he aſſumes to himſelf, in the Churches Conſults, a negative voice.—* To hinder alſo the execution of the Churches former Canons in his Territories, ſo long as theſe not admitted amongſt his Laws.—* Again, when ſome former Church-Doctrine ſeems to Him to vary from Gods Truth; or ſome Canon of the Church to reſtrain the juſt

liberty of his Subjects, I mean, as to ſpiritual matters, then either Himſelf, and Council of State, againſt all the Clergy; or joined with ſome *ſmaller* part of the Clergy of his own Kingdom, againſt a much *major* part; or joined with the *whole* Clergy of his own Dominions againſt a *Superior* Council; to *make Reformations* herein, as is by them thought fit. — * Laſtly, To prohibit the entrance of any Clergy, ſave ſuch as is *Arrian*, into his Kingdom, under a Capital puniſhment; who ſees not, that ſuch an *Arrian* Prince, juſtified in the exerciſe of any ſuch power, and, ſo the Church obliged to ſubmit to it, muſt needs, within the circuit of his Command, overthrow the *Catholick Religion*; and that the *neceſſary* means of continuing, there, the truth of the Goſpel is withdrawn from the *Church*, And the ſame it would be here, if the *Clergy*, within ſuch a Dominion, ſhould, upon any pretended cauſe, declare themſelves freed from obedience to their Eccleſiaſtical Superiors; or, by I know not what priviledge, tranſlate their Superiors Authority to the Prince.

§. 25. Many of theſe *Juriſdictions*, vindicated by the Church, are ſo clearly due to her, for the ſubſiſtence of true Religion, as that ſeveral paſſages in many *Learned Proteſtants* ſeem to join with *Catholicks* in the defence of them, of which I ſhall give you a large view in another Diſcourſe. Mean while ſee that of Dr. *Field*, quoted below, § 49. and, at your leiſure, Mr. *Thorndikes* Treatiſe of the *Rights of the Church*, in a Chriſtian State; and B. *Carleton's*, of *Juriſdiction Regal*, and *Epiſcopal*. In the laſt place, then, this Bar was ſet by the Church, againſt any *Clergies* making uſe of the *Secular* Power, for remitting their *Subjection* to the Laws and Conſtitutions of their *Eccleſiaſtical* Superiors; or for poſſeſſing themſelves of any Eccleſiaſtical *Dignities*, or *Juriſdictions*, contrary to the Churches *Canons*.

§. 26. Now then, to ſum together all that hath been ſaid of theſe *Subordinations* of Clergy, *Perſons*, and *Councils* (ſo high as the Patriarchal), for preſerving a perpetual unity in the Church; ¹ Firſt, No *Introduction*, or *Ordination*, of inferior Clergy could any where be made without the approbation, or confirmation of the Superior. § 27. ² The ſeveral *Councils*, were to be *called*, when need required, and to be *moderated*, by their reſpective Eccleſiaſtical *Superiors*, and matters of more general concernment, there, not to be paſſed by the Council, without his conſent: § 28. nor by him, without theirs, or the major part of them. ³ All *differences* about Doctrine, Manners, or Diſcipline, ariſing amongſt inferior perſons, or Councils, were to be decided by

by their *Superiors*, till we come to the highest of these, the *Patriarchal* Council. And, in the Intervals of Councils, the respective *Prelates* and *Presidents* thereof, were to take care of the *Execution* of their Canons; as also, to receive and decide *appeals* in such matters, for which it was thought not so necessary to convene a Synod, amongst which, the differences with, or between, *Primates*, were to be decided by the *Patriarch*; those with, or between, Patriarchs, by the *Proto-Patriarch*; assisted with such a *Council*, as might with convenience be procured. * In clashing between any Inferior, and Superior, Authority, when these commanded several things, the Subjects of both were to adhere, and submit, to the Judgment, and Sentence of the *Superior*. † All these things were to be transacted in the Church, concerning *causes* purely *Ecclesiastical*, and Spiritual, without the controulment of, or appeal to, any *secular Judges*, or Courts, under penalty of excommunication to the Clergy, so appealing. §. 29.

Now in such a well, and close-woven Series of dependence, what entrance can there be for pretended *Reformations* by Inferiors against the higher Ecclesiastical Powers, without incurring *Schisme*? Whether of I know not what, *Independents*, *Fanaticks*, and *Quakers*, against *Presbyters*; or, of Presbyters against *Bishops* (Reformations which the Church of *England* hath a long time deplored); or, of Bishops against the Metropolitan; and so up to the Prime Patriarch, the supreme Governour in the Church of Christ. And next: What *degree* of obedience can be devised less (I speak, as to the determinations of matters of Doctrine), than a *non-contradicting* of these *Superiors*? Which obedience only had it been yielded by the first *Reformers*, whatever more perhaps might have been demanded of them by the *Church*, yet thus had the door been shut against all entring in of *Controversie* in matters of Religion once defined: And, though some still might themselves wander out of its Pale; yet, in their forbearing Disputes, the rest of the Churches Subjects would have slept quietly in her bosom, unassaulted, and so unswayed, with their *new* Tenents. And perhaps those others also in time have been made ashamed of their own *singularity*, when they were debarred of this means of gaining Followers, and making themselves *Captains* of a *Sect*. §. 30.

CHAP. III.

Of Councils General.

1. *The neceſſary Compoſition of them, conſidered with relation to the acceptation of them by Abſents.* §. 35.
   This Acceptation in what meaſure requiſite. §. 39.
2. *To whom belongs the Preſidentſhip in theſe Councils.* §. 47.
3. *And, Calling of them.* §. 47.

§. 31. THis (from §. 9.) ſaid of all inferior Perſons, and Councils, and their Preſidents, ſo high as a Patriarchal: of their ſeveral Subordinations, and Obedience, in any diſſent, due ſtill to the ſuperior Court, or Prelate. Now I come to the ſupreme Council, *Oecumenical*, or *General*; (the Rules and Laws of which may be partly collected from the former). Wherein the chief Conſiderables are; 1 The *Compoſition*; of what, or what number of perſons it muſt neceſſarily conſiſt: 2 The *Preſident-ſhip* in it; and the *Calling* of it; to whom they belong.

§. 32. 1°. Then, for the *Compoſition*, It is neceſſary, that it be ſuch, either wherein all the Patriarchs, (or at leaſt, ſo many of them as are Catholick) with many of their Biſhops, do meet in perſon, or where, after All called to It, and the Biſhops of ſo many Provinces, as can well be convened, ſitting in Council, headed by the Prime Patriarch, or his Legates, Delegates are ſent by the reſt; or, at leaſt, the Acts, and Decrees thereof, in their neceſſary abſence, are accepted, and approved by them, and by the ſeveral Provinces under them; or, by the major part of thoſe Provinces.

§. 33. For; a *General*, or *Oecumenical*, Council, ſuch as doth conſiſt of *all* the *Biſhops* of the Catholick Univerſe, met together, there never hath been any; but, in thoſe which are generally, by Proteſtants, as well as Catholicks, reputed, and admitted for ſuch, ſometimes we find a greater, ſometimes a ſmaller number, according to the propinquity of the place, the peace of the times, the numeroſity of Sects, &c. So the four firſt General Councils,

cils all held in the East, by reason of the Heresies, they opposed, chiefly reigning in that Coast, consisted mostly of Oriental Bishops. The first General Council, of *Nice*, had present in it only. 2. Presbyters (the Bishop of *Rome*'s Legates), and 3. Bishops of the *Occidental* Churches. The 2d General Council, of *Constantinople*, had in it no Occidental Bishop at all; but only was *confirmed* by the Bishop of *Rome*, and his Occidental Council assembled in *Rome*, not long after it. The 3d. General Council of *Ephesus*, had only 3. Delegates sent to it from the Bishop of *Rome*, and his Occidental Synod. The 4th. of *Chalcedon*, had only 4. Legates, sent thither from the Bishop of *Rome*; after that the Western Bishops, assembled in several Provincial Synods, had communicated their judgment to them, in the Controversie then agitated; and besides these, 2. *African* Bishops, and one *Sicilian*. Where note; That the 3d. also, of these Councils transacted most of their business, and condemned *Nestorius* the Bishop of *Constantinople*, without the presence of the *Antiochian* Patriarch, and his Bishops, who retarded his journey in favour of *Nestorius*, (though afterwards he, and his, consented also to his Condemnation): And that the 4th. Council acted all things, without *Dioscorus*, the *Alexandrian* Patriarch; whom also they deposed, for his favouring the Heretical Party; and for his Contumacy against the See of *Rome*. See *Conc. Chalced.* Act 4.

§. 34. Yet all these Councils, whether the Bishops personally present, were fewer, or more, were accounted *equally* valid; from the *After-acceptation*. and admittance of their Decrees by the *Prelates* absent; *i. e.* the acceptation of such persons, as, if present, had had a Vote in them. *All* which *Prelates*, were they personally present in the Council, or the *much major* part of them, there would be no further need of any approbation of the Church Catholick, or, of any other Members thereof, to confirm its acts; nor are they any way capable thereof; because the remainder of the Church diffusive (I mean of those, who have any decisive vote in Ecclesiastical affairs) must be concluded, in their Judgment, and Sentence, by this supposed *much-major* part thereof, that are *personally present* in the Council. But this wanting, the other compleatsits defect. And upon such *Acceptation* it is, that the 2d. and the 5th. of the Councils called General; held at *Constantinople*, without the Pope, or his Legat's presence therein, yet bear the name of General, because the Decrees of the former of them were accepted by *Damasus*, and his Occidental Council, convened not long after it; and the latter, after some time, accepted by *Vigilius*, and his Successors, with the Western Bishops; as, on

on the contrary, for want of such *Acceptation*, the 2d. *Ephesin* Council, though for its meeting as entire and full, as most of the other called Oecumenical, yet was never esteemed such, because its Decrees, though passed by a major part of the *present* Bishops, were opposed by the Popes Legates in the Council; and by Him, and the main Body of the Occidental Prelates, out of it.

§. 35. And, upon this General *Acceptation* also, inferior Councils may become, in their Obligation, equivalent to Generall: since, however the Churches Testimony is received; whether *conjunctly*, or *by parts*; yet—*Ecclesia universa errare non potest in necessariis.* So *Bellarmine* observes, ancient Councils, less than General, very frequently to have determined matters of Faith. —*Haresin* Pauli Samosateni *damnavit Concilium Antiochenum paucorum Episcoporum* (Euseb *l.* 7. *c.* 24.) *nec alii, multò plures in toto mundo, conquesti sunt; sed ratum habuerunt:* —*Haresin* Macedonii *damnavit Concilium* Constantinopolitanum; *in quo nullus fuit Latinorum; Latini probaverunt. Haresim* Pelagii *damnaverunt Concilia Provincialia; Milevitanum, & Carthaginense.* —*Haresim* Nestorii *damnavit Concilium Ephesinum, antequam adessent Latini; Latini voluerunt cognoscere rem gestam, & cognitam approbaverunt.* All which Determinations of lesser Councils received their strength from the *General* Body of the Church *owning* them. Neither did, or ought, such inferior Councils, when necessitated by contentions, and disputes, define any such thing, *hastily*, or *rashly*; but as they well knew, before any such Resolution, the common Sentiments of the Church Catholick herein. Thus the Paucity of Church-Prelates in Councils is shewed to infer a necessity of an after-Acceptation by absents to ratifie its Acts.

De Concil. l. 2. *c.* 28.

§. 36. 1. Next: Concerning the just quality, measure, and proportion, of this *after-Acceptation*, several things are to be well observed. 1st. That it is not to be extended, (in a Latitude of Christianity much greater), beyond the bounds of the Church *Catholick.* Which *Catholick* Church is many times of a narrower compass, than the *Christian* Profession; all *Heretical*, and *Schismatical* Churches (I mean, such as have made a former discession, in Doctrine, or external Communion, from their lawful Ecclesiastical Superiors, and, being but a part, have separated from the former whole, standing contradistinct to it. So, after the *Nicene* Council, in *Constantines* time, the *Arrians*, and in *S. Austins* time, the *Donatists*, were esteemed, though Christians, yet no Catholicks; and the *Catholick Church* was named still as a *part* of Christianity, opposite to them. Of which thus *S. Austin* † —*Te-*

† *Contra Epist. Fund. c.* 4.

—*Tenemus, juſtiſſimè, in Eccleſiæ gremio ipſum* Catholicæ *nomen, quod* [nomen], *non ſine causâ, inter tam multas hæreſes, ſic ista Eccleſia ſola obtinuit.* Therefore, upon the growth of many Hereſies, after the Heathen perſecutions ceaſed, inſtead of theſe words of the Apoſtles Creed, [*I believe the Holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints*, (i. e.) *in it*] we read in this Creed, as explained by Councils, [*I believe One, Holy, Catholick, and Apoſtolick Church:*] 1. *One*, to diſtinguiſh it from *many*, varying, Sects, pretending alſo to be true Churches of Chriſt. 2. *Holy*; *i. e.* as to the external maintaining the true and holy Faith, Manners, Sacraments, Government, Diſcipline, delivered by our Lord, and his Apoſtles; and, in particular, *Holy*, as maintaining no Doctrine contrary to *Holineſs*; but not *Holy*; ſo as that ſome *external* Members thereof may not be, by their own default, *internally*, unholy and unſanctified, and no true Members of Chriſt. 3. *Apoſtolick*; *i. e.* Succeeding them by un-interrupted Ordinations; and preſerving their Traditions, for Doctrine, Government, and Diſcipline. And therefore here the other Clauſe, [*the Communion of Saints*] is omitted, as ſufficiently included in the former Explication; which is obſerved alſo by Dr. *Hammond*, (of *Fundamentals*, p. 69, & 83.) So, in the yet more enlarged, *Athanaſian* Creed, we find the Catholick Faith uſed in a reſtrained ſence, oppoſed to all thoſe Hereſies, that are rejected by that Creed. And to this notion of *Church Catholick*, See, in *Diſc.* 1. §. 37. & 44. Learned Proteſtants willingly conſenting.

§. 37. 2. 2ly. This Acceptation, in reſpect of the *Catholick Church*, (*i. e.* of thoſe Prelates, that be not formerly, by any Hereſie, or Schiſme, ſhut out of it,) cannot rationally be required, abſolutely univerſal of *all*, but only of the conſiderably *Major* part of them; for in a Government not ſimply Monarchical, whether Eccleſiaſtical, or Civil, no Laws can be promulgated, nor Unity preſerved, if of their Governors the fewer be not regulated by a major part: and it hath been ſhewed at large, *Diſc.* 2. §. 25. (which I deſire the Reader to review, and conſider well, becauſe much weight is laid upon it) that the Decrees of the firſt 4 General Councils were none of them eſtabliſhed with ſuch a plenary acceptation: the practice of which Councils is a ſufficient Rule, and Warrant to poſterity: Nor, otherwiſe, can any new Hereſie, patronized by any Biſhops formerly Catholick, (as the moſt pernicious Hereſies have ever been), be ever legally ſuppreſſed, ſo long as ſuch Prelates perſiſt in their diſſent from the reſt. See what hath been ſaid of this in *Diſc.* 1. §. 28, 38, 39. & *Diſc.* 3. §. 11, & 37.

That

Hamond

That ſtrict condition therefore, which Dr. *Hammond* requires to authentize, and ratifie the Definitions, and Canons of General Councils in reſpect of Acceptation, ſeems not reaſonable; Namely, *That after their promulgation* [at leaſt, if not before] *they ſhould be accepted by each Provincial Council, and acknowledged to agree with that Faith, which they had originally received* (of Her. §. 6. n. 8, 12.). —Or, *That ſuch Conciliar Declarations ſhould be univerſally received by all Churches,* (Her. §. 14. n. 4.): *becauſe ſuch are* (ſaith he) *Chriſtians, and Biſhops, as well as the Biſhop of* Rome; *and conſequently their Negatives, as evident prejudices to, and as utterly unreconcileable with, an univerſal Affirmative, as the Popes can be,* &c. Like to which (§. 12. n. 6.) he argues thus, concerning the abſence, or diſſent, of any Biſhops from a Council—*That the promiſe, of the Gates of Hell not prevailing againſt the Church, can no way belong to a Council, unleſs all the Members of a Church were met together in a Council*; [I add, or, when met, do conſent] *for if there be any left out, why may not the promiſe be good in them, though the Gates of Hell ſhould be affirmed to prevail againſt the Council.* And, §. 5. n. 3. —*That, if the matter delivered by a Council be not teſtified from all places, it is not qualified for our belief, as* Catholick, *in reſpect of place; becauſe the Faith being one, and the ſame, and by all, and every of the Apoſtles, depoſited in all their Plantations, what was ever really thus taught, by any of them, in any Church, will alſo be found to have been taught, and received, in all other Apoſtolical Churches.* And, §. 10 n. 2, 3. He concludes the Canon of the 7th. General Council not obliging; —*becauſe the contrary Doctrine being delivered before in a Provincial Council, that of* Eliberis, [which is not true], *yields* (ſaith he) *an irrefragable proof, that the Doctrine of the* 2d. Nicene *Council, was not teſtified, by all the Churches, of all ages, to be of Tradition Apoſtolical.* I ſay, ſuch an univerſal acceptation as this, of every Church, or Province, ſeems upon any ſuch pretence, unreaſonably exacted.

1° 1ſt. Becauſe all Conciliary Definitions are not (as he ſaith there they are) only Declarations, and Teſtifications of ſuch Apoſtolical Traditions, as were left by them evident, and conſpicuous, in all Chriſtian Churches planted by them; but are, many times, Determinations of points deduced from, and neceſſarily conſequential to, ſuch clear Traditionals, whether written, or unwritten.

2° 2ly. Becauſe, if the Acts of General Councils were only ſuch *Declarations* of Apoſtolical Tradition, yet, it is poſſible, that ſome particular Church may, in time, depart from ſuch a Tradition, entruſted unto them: (elſe how can any Church become Heretical, againſt any ſuch Tradition?) and ſo, when their acceptance

is

is asked, may refuse to acknowledge, what all the rest justifie. And all this clearly appears in those *Bishops* or *Churches*, that made some opposition to the Decrees of the 4. first General Councils; and in the opposition of S. *Cyprian*, and his Bishops, concerning *Rebaptization*.

§. 41. 3.

3ly. For the manner of this *Approbation* of such *major part*; It is thought sufficient, if it be a *tacit*, and *interpretative*, Approbation only (and not positive, or expres; for who can shew this, to most allowed Councils?) Namely, when such Decrees being promulgated, they signifie no opposition thereto. Of which thus *Franciscus à Sancta Clarâ* (System. fidei, *c.* 23. *p.* 262) — *Neq; tamen dubitandum est, quin statim obligare incipiant actus Conciliares, si non appareat Ecclesiarum (non dico hujus, vel illius, vel aliquorum pravorum hominum) reclamatio; nam præsumendum est, omnes consensisse, si non constet oppositum: ut etiam acutè observavit Mirandula, ubi post alia dicit — Quoad dum universalis Ecclesia non reclamari, necessario credendum est.* And thus Dr. *Hammond*, of *Heres.* §. 6. n. 15. 16. — *When a Doctrine is conciliarly agreed on, it is then promulgated to all; and the universal, though but tacit, approbation, and reception thereof, the no considerable contradiction given to it in the Church, is a competent evidence, that this is the judgment, and concordant Tradition of the whole Church, though no resolution of Provincial Synods* [which was used before some General Councils] *hath preceded. — But if their Acts are contradicted, and protested against, this evidently prejudiceth the Authority of that Council.* And Archbishop *Laud*, §. 26. p. 195. saith, — *It is a sufficient confirmation to a General Council — if, after it is ended, the whole Church admit it, though never so tacitly. The whole Church admit it*, saith he. And, *the whole*, say we, or, such a major part of the whole, as ought to conclude the rest. Which admission also is sufficiently discerned in the most general Conformity, to such Decrees, in mens profession, and practice. For it is all reason, that where we cannot have, *Quod creditum est ubiq; ab omnibus; semper*; by reason of some divisions in the Church, we hold to what is nearest it, *quod creditum est in pluribus locis, & à pluribus, & diutius or antiquius*; For the *plures, pluribus locis*, joined in one Communion with the Ecclesiastical Head of the Church here on earth, are the secureſt Expositors to us, of *quod antiquius*; or, *quod creditum semper*. See *Disc.* 3. §. 11.

§. 42. 4.

4ly. For the applying of this Acceptation to all the Decrees of a Council, or only to some, whilst some other Decrees are disclaimed (as sometimes happens): Here also, so far as a due Acceptation is extended, so far is our Obligation, nor can any

reasonably argue, that, if some Acts of a Council are, by some after-opposition, rendred invalid, therefore no other things passed in that Council, and generally approved, have force.

§. 43. 5.

§ 7. What is said here of the *non-approbation* of some Prelates, or Churches (as frequently happens) its not invalidating a Council, or its Decrees, must be said also of the *absence* of some Prelates from the Council, or of their non-concurrence, when sitting in it; their *absence*, 1. Either voluntary; as, of those, who, heterodox in opinion, and fewer in number, foresee, that probably they shall be over voted by the rest: (as the *Arrian* Prelates did absent themselves from the Council of *Sardica*; and so, might also have absented themselves from that of *Nice*; or again, the *Eutychian* Prelats, from *Chalcedon*) notwithstanding whose absence, or non-concurrence, the Council will not cease to bear the just title of General (provided, that it consist of a *major part* of the Christian Churches, and have the concurrence of the *Prime Patriarch*; without whom *nihil firmum*): Otherwise an Heretical, or Schismatical, Church can secure themselves, as they please, from being condemned by any General Council; which, as long as they are absent, will be called not General, and so its force cannot extend to them. Nay; otherwise, after any defection from the Orthodox Faith, or after any considerable Schism in the Church, now, there can never be any more Oecumenical Councils; because, forsooth, that party fallen away will give no meeting to the other, too prevalent; and thus General Councils cease to have any being, when there first begins to be any need of them. Of this thus a Learned Protestant ‖ with intention to make the 5th. Council a General one without the presence of the Pope, and his Occidental Bishops.—*The Presidence, and Presence* (saith he) *of the Bishop of Rome is not so necessary in General Councils; but that, in case of his wilful refusal, a Council may proceed, and be holden for lawful, without his consenting to it.* And,—*As a Council may be holden in such a case* [i. e. they refusing to come], *without the presence, and concurrence of the Roman Bishop, and those that are subject to him; so, being present, if he refuse to concur in judgment with the rest, they may proceed without him, and their sentence may be of force, though he consent not to it.* What, then, they presume to affirm, thus, of the *Roman*, they must not deny, of their *own* Bishops. This, that the voluntary absence of some Prelates doth not invalidate a Council, or its Acts. 2. Neither yet doth the absence forced of some others; if such, as being formerly justly excommunicated, or anathematized, have now no right to any voting in such Councils, though perhaps, if admitted, these

‖ Dr. *Field*, p. 851.

these might equal the Orthodox in number. Thus *Gelasius* Bishop of *Rome* † concerning the *Eutychians* (when very numerous in the East) and also of the Favourers of them, not to be admitted to a Council.—*Ecclesiastici moris non est, cum his, qui pulsum habent communionem, permixtamq; cum perfidis, miscere Concilium.* —And, *Meritò ab Apostolicâ sede, cæterisq; Catholicis, non jam consulendi erant, sed potiùs notandi*, &c. † Epist. *ad Episcopos Dardaniæ.*

6ly. What hath been here said of the necessary *Constitution*, or *Composition* of a General Council, and *Ratification* of its Acts, must be said exactly, on the same ground, concerning a *Patriarchal* or other inferior Council: that it is not necessary, that all the Bishops of such Patriarchy, be assembled; or, absent, do accept, and ratifie it, to make it *Legal*, or *Obligatory*. §. 44. 6.

2. This said concerning the necessary *Composition* of a General Council; come we next to the *Presidency*, and *Moderatorship* therein. §. 45.

1. Where, 1st. As it hath been already shewed, in all the other Synods, ‖ Protestants consenting †, that the Presidentship in them, without any new election made by the Council, or yet by the secular power, belongs to him, who hath the prime place, and dignity; the presiding in the Provincial Council, to the *Metropolitan*: in the National Council, where be many Metropolitans, to the *Primate* of them, &c. which President, also, had in these Councils a negative voice †: To it seems all reason, that, in a General Council also, that Prelate should preside, who is the Bishop of the chief See; and, to whom, in all ages, all other Churches, and Prelates, have allowed the Primacy; i. e. the Bishop of *Rome* (See 2. Gen. Counc. *c.* 5.) All reason, I say, That the *Primate* of the *Patriarchs* Preside in a General Council, as the *Primate* of the *Metropolitans*, in a National. And, that, what other Priviledges these other Presidents enjoyed in those Councils, the same at least (though we set aside here his universal Pastorship) He should enjoy in This: agreeable to that ancient Canon, and Custom, in the universal Church, (mentioned by *Socrates*, l. 2. c. 13. —And *Sozomen*, l. 2. c. 13.—And, vindicated, by Pope *Innocent*, *apud* Augost. *Epist.* 90.—And, yet more anciently, by Pope *Julius*, against some Oriental Bishops, *apud Athanas.* Apol. 2.) —*Sine Romano Pontifice nihil statuendum.* ‖ §. 9, &c † §. 16. † See, before, §. 10.

2ly. If, in this Matter, *Prescription* may be of any force, *de facto*, the Prime Patriarch, the Bishop of *Rome*, in the ancient Councils General hath always been allowed this Presidentship. As will appear to any reviewing the Church-History for the first 8. §. 46.

General Councils: In 4. of which Councils, namely, the 4th. 6th. 7th. and 8th. the Protestants grant it without dispute. Next, For his Presidency in the 3d. General Council, it seems evident enough, from the testimony of *Evagrius*‖, that *Cyril* Bishop of *Alexandria* was deputed by him to execute this Office; who saith, *That the Bishops meeting in that Council*— Cyrillo *locum* Celestini, *Episcopatum antiqua* Romæ *gerentis, obtinente, accersunt* Nestorium, &c. whose Deputy also *Cyril* was made before, for the excommunication of *Nestorius* by the Authority of the Apostolical See; as appears in the Pope's Letter to *Cyril*† — *Nostrâ vice, & loco, cum potestate, usus, ejusmodi sententiam exequêris, &c.*

‖ *l.* 1. *c.* 4. & *Conc. Eph.* pars 2. Act. 1.

† *Act. Concil. Eph.* Tom. 1.

For the 2d. and 5th. General Council, both held at *Constantinople*; as it is true, that the Pope presided not in them, because indeed neither He, nor his Legates were present in them; so it is true, that these Councils were not General, till they were, after their Session, accepted by him, and the other Western Churches. But yet both these Councils, apparently enough, yield the Presidency to him in general Councils: the 5th. (which much courted his presence) in express terms, in *Eutychius* the Patriarch of *Constantinople* his Letter to him‖— *Petimus, præsidente nobis vestrâ Beatitudine, communi tractatu, eadem capitula in medio proponenda quæri*, &c. And the 2d. in that which infers his presidency, whilst the Bishop of *Constantinople*, who in the absence of him, and his Legates, presided in it, challengeth *Primatus honorem* only *post Romanum Episcopum*.†— And that Council, in their Epistle to *Damasus* the Roman Bishop, acknowledge their meeting in that Council by order of his Letters.—*Concurreramus* Constantinopolim *ad vestra Reverentia literas*. Now for the *first* Council, That of *Nice*, which only remains: Here also the Popes Legates are found to subscribe the first, before all the other Patriarchs: only *Hosius* bearing no title, save Bishop of *Corduba*, gives his Vote, and attests the *Nicene* Creed, before these Legates; which hath caused much dispute. *Gelazius Cyzicenus*‖ and some other Ancients, say, *Hosius* presided in it, as *Sylvestri Episcopi Maxima Roma locum obtinens* (And indeed, the Popes Primacy before the other Patriarchs, and so, much more, before a Bishop of his own Patriarchy, being granted; and no mention being made of any such Presidentship conferred on *Hosius*, either by election of the Council, or of the Emperor, what can be said, but that he held such Presidency only in this capacity, *viz.* the Popes Deputation, (as *Cyril* also did in the 3d. General Council) unless any will say, that his voting in the first place, was a pure indulgence of honour to him, as being a Confessor in *Diocletian's* days, and narrowly missing Martyrdom;

‖ *Conc. Constan.* Collat. 1.

† *Conc. Constant.* c. 5.

Act. Conc. Nic. *l.* 2. *c.* 5.

dom; * the Emperor's especial Favourite, sent by him formerly to compose the differences in *Egypt* ||; * a person, as *Athanasius* saith of him, † *Ob tantos labores omni Reverentiâ dignus* ||: and now, the Compiler of the new Form of the *Nicene* Creed. To which Creed therefore himself gives the first testimony in this form — *Hosius Episcopus Civitatis Cordubensis, Provinciæ* Hispaniæ *dixit; Ita credo, sicut superius scriptum est*, after which consent of his, follows in the first place, the Pope's Legates *Subscripsimus*; and then that of the other Patriarchs, and Bishops. Where it may also be considered, what Dr. *Field* hath observed ‖ *That the Subscriptions, in the first Councils, were more irregular; and no such certain, and uniform course kept in giving preeminences to the chief Bishops, as was afterward*; For, in this Council, the third Patriarch of *Antioch* subscribes not only after the Bishops of *Egypt*, but of *Palestine*, and several others subject to his own Patriarchate. And thus far the same Dr. *Field* proceeds in deferring this Presidentship to the Bishop of *Rome*; *All Antiquity* (saith he †) *yielded to the Bishop of* Rome *a Presidentship of honour to have preeminence in place, to propose things to be debated, to direct the Actions, and to give definitive Sentence according to the Voices and Judgment of the Council.* [He might have added: And in matters concerning Faith, to render the Act of it invalid, and unconclusive to the Church, without his consent, according to the ancient Canon; *Sine Romano Pontifice nihil sinendum*, &c. as appears in his nulling the Act of the second *Ephesine* Council voting *Eutychianisme*]: *but not a Presidentship of power, to have the power not only of directing, but of ruling their doings also that are assembled in Council, and to conclude of matters after his own judgment, though the greater part of the Council like it not, yea though no part like it.* [But such a Presidentship of power in the Pope, as to conclude matters after his own judgment, either against the whole, or major part of a General Council, is denied as well by modern Catholicks, as by Protestants, or Antiquity.]

Euseb. de vita Const. l. 2. c. 62. Socrat. l. 1. c. 4. † *Apolog. 2. Epist. ad Solit. vitam agentes.*

‖ p. 652.

† p. 653.

3ly. What of *Presiding* in, the same is to be said of the *Calling of*, General Councils. 1. Where, 1st. It seems all reason, that, such Meetings being Consultations for the better managing of affairs purely Ecclesiastical, and for the better setling and preserving of the Churches Unity, and Peace, (of the necessity of which meetings the Clergy can best judge), All reason, I say, it seems, that the *Calling* of them should belong to the *Clergy*, especially, when the secular powers are not Christian. And this also we find in the Church's practice; that both that first Council, *Act.* 15. and all those following, till *Constantine's* days, were

§. 47. 1.

were assembled by the Churche's *sole* Authority, without the Prince's concurrence, or leave; and, if amongst these Councils, none save the first, were absolutely General, yet this was not from a defect of power in the Church to convene such a Council, but that she thought, in such a secular opposition, her affairs might be, by many divided Councils Provincial more privately, and securely dispatched, as the Controversie about *Easter* was in the second Century.

This *Right* therefore, formerly possessed by the Church, Princes, by their submitting unto it, and becoming Christian, cannot justly take away: nor may be thought to do so, by their accumulative power in assisting the Church from time to time for procuring the more effectual concurrence, (which much depends on their temporal penalties), of such great Assemblies. But whatever priviledge of *calling* General Councils should be allowed to Princes so long as Catholick, yet at least that Right, which in this matter is conceded to belong to the Church, in case the Emperor, or Prince, be Infidel, must also be resumed in case the Prince Christian be an enemy to the Orthodox Faith: (*i. e.*) be either Heretical, or Schismatical (of which likewise it belongs to the Supreme Governors of the Church to judge:) For, What mischief may the Church suffer from *unbelieving*, that she may not also suffer from *Heretical*, Princes? And again must also be resumed, in case the secular Princes, through whose Dominions the Catholick Church is dispersed, be many; of many several temporal Interests; and, in respect of these, not facil to concur in the calling such Council, where the Church apprehends need.

§ 48. 2. 2. Next; This hath been shewed already, §. 9.– & 16. n. 4. in all the inferior Synods, Protestants consenting, 1. That the Right of calling them, though the Prince be Christian, belongs to such an Ecclesiastical person, as hath either a superiority of *Power* over the Members of such Synod, (as, in a Provincial Synod, the *Metropolitan* hath*); or at least, the superiority of *Order*, and *Place*, (as in a National Synod, the *Primate* hath, in respect of the other Metropolitans, whereof it consists): 2. And Belongs to such Ecclesiastical persons, without their first consulting any other preparatory Synod, about calling such Synods: 3. And again, belongs to some of them (as the calling of *Patriarchal* Synods, to the *Patriarch*) when the Bishops, so called together by him, do live under many several secular Governments; Yet—*which Patriarchs* (saith Dr. Field‖) *are neither so depending of, nor subject to, the power of Princes, but that when they are enemies to the Faith* [I add Faith, either Christian, or

* 11. Sa. Bellarm: de Conc: l. 1. c. 12. §. Add: q.

‖ p. 653.

Ca-

Catholick] *they may exercise the same without their consent, and privity, and subject them, that refuse to obey their Summons, to such punishments, as the Canons of the Church do prescribe in cases of such contempt, or wilful negligence.* And the 8th. General Council, (Can. 17.) upon occasion of some Metropolitans, *qui, ne secundum vocationem Apostolici Præsulis occurrant, à mundi Principibus se detineri, sine ratione, causantur,* declares also thus against such Princes— *Cum Princeps pro suis causis conventum frequenter agat, impium esse, ut summos Præsules ad Synodos pro Ecclesiasticis negotiis celebrandum impediant, vel quosdam ab eorum Conciliis prohibeant:* And all these things are justified, and allowed by Protestants: Suitably then to all the rest it seems all reason, That the calling of a *General Council, i.e.* a Synod consisting of many Patriarchs, and their Patriarchies, should belong to the Primate of the Patriarchs, or Bishop of the chief See; though we suppose, that he claim no more, than a preeminency of order, as Primates do over Metropolitans.

§. 49. Of this matter therefore some Learned Protestants seem to speak more moderately. 1st. Thus Mr. *Thorndike* concerning the Right of *Calling Councils* its belonging to the Church, *Epil.* p. 33.—*I must* (saith he) *here not omit to allege the Authority of Councils; and to maintain, the Right, and Power of holding them, and the obligation, which the Decrees of them, regularly made, is able to create, to stand by the same Authority of the Apostles:* He accounting that Assembly (*Act.* 1.) at the election of *Matthias*, a General Council; and again, that, *Act.* 15.

And then, thus B. *Bramhal*, concerning the *Prime Patriarch*'s calling such Council, *Schism-guarded*, p. 356.—*If the Pope,* (saith he) *hath any right, either to convocate General Councils himself, or to represent to Christian Soveraigns the fit Seasons for convocation of them, either in respect of his beginning of Unity, or of his Protopatriarchate, we do not envy it him, since there may be a good use of it in respect of the division of the Empire, so good caution be observed.* *Bellarmine* || *confesseth that power which we acknowledge; that is, that, though the Pope be no Ecclesiastical Monarch, but only Chief of the principal Patriarchs, yet the Right to convocate General Councils should pertain unto him.* So B. *Bramhal.*

|| *De Concil.* l. 1. c. 12.

Dr. *Field* speaks yet more distinctly, and copiously †—*The State of the Christian Church* (saith he) *being spiritual, is such, that it may stand, though not only forsaken, but grievously oppressed, by the great men of the world: and therefore it is by all resolved on; that the Church hath her Guides and Rulers distinct from them that bear the Sword: and that there is, in the Church, a power of convocating these her*

† *Of the Chur.* l. p. 697.

her ſpiritual Paſtors, to conſult of things concerning her welfare, though none of the Princes of the world do favour her. — *And there is no queſtion, but that this power* [of convocating theſe Paſtors] *is in them that are firſt, and before other, in each company of ſpiritual Paſtors, and Miniſters* — *Hereupon we ſhall find, that the calling of Dioceſan Synods pertaineth to the Biſhop; of Provincial, to the Metropolitan; of National, to the Primate; and of Patriarchal, to the Patriarch.* And of theſe he ſaith — *That they neither are ſo depending*, &c. quoted before, §. 48. Laſtly, Concerning the Calling of General Councils — *In times of perſecution* (ſaith he) *and when there are no Chriſtian Princes* [*i. e.* to aſſiſt the Church, as he ſaith afterward] — *If there be any matter of Faith, or any thing concerning the whole State of the Chriſtian Church, wherein a common deliberation of all the Paſtors of the Church is neceſſary, he that is in order the firſt among the Patriarchs, with the Synods of Biſhops ſubject to him, may call the reſt together, as being the principal part of the Church, whence all actions of this nature do take beginning.* Inſtancing in *Julius*, and *Damaſus*, Biſhops of *Rome*, with their Councils, practiſing this. So Dr. *Field*.

§. 50. Only, here you ſee two limitations, or bars, put in by him, for the Reformation to make ſome advantage of. The one, *In times of perſecution*, or, *when the Church hath not Princes to aſſiſt her*, then, the power of *Calling General Councils* to belong to the *Clergy*. The other, (That then it belongs, in the Clergy, to the prime Patriarch; yet not ſingly; but, *joined with his Council*; for (ſaith he ||) *the firſt Patriarch hath not power, ſingly, to call together the other Patriarchs, and their Biſhops, becauſe none of them is ſuperior to another in degree, as Biſhops are to Presbyters, nor ſo, in Order, Honour, and Place, as Metropolitans are to Biſhops; or Patriarchs, to Metropolitans.* Now to the firſt of theſe, his limiting this Eccleſiaſtical power only to times of perſecution, ſee what hath been ſaid already ||; and his own inſtances prove againſt it; for *Julius*, and *Damaſus*, ſummoned the Oriental Biſhops to ſuch a Council. the one of them in the Reign of *Conſtans*, the other, of *Theodoſius*, both of theſe being Chriſtian, Orthodox, Catholick. Emperors. Though, if this be allowed, that in any non-aſſiſtance of the ſecular powers (Heathen, or Chriſtian, it matters not) the Church hath power, when ſhe judgeth it requiſite, to aſſemble ſuch Councils, more needs not be deſired. Concerning his ſecond Limitation; In the reaſon he gives for it, he omits one Superiority among the reſt, which would have fitted the purpoſe; namely, the Superiority, that *Primates* have to the other *Metropolitans*, in their calling a *National* Synod, and that without

|| p. 668.

§. 47.

without any Aſſembly of the Primate's own Biſhops, firſt conſulted: I ask therefore, why not the *Primate* of the *Patriarchs*, do the like? 2ly. If the firſt Patriarch ſingly have no authority for calling together the other Patriarchs, neither hath he, *joined* with his *Synod*; his Synod having no more power over other Patriarchs, than himſelf. As for the Inſtances: *Julius* ſent to the Orientals, ſingly, concerning a Council, to be joined of both the Eaſt and Weſt. *Damaſus* indeed ſent, when a Weſtern Council was fitting; but this called for other matters, and not for this, to give him a Commiſſion for ſuch a Summons, or to join with him in it; as if the firſt Patriarch cannot, when need requires, call a General Council without firſt Summoning, and convening a Patriarchal Council, to give their conſent to the calling of this General: A thing, to which the Churches practice is known to be contrary; and alſo the convening of a Patriarchal Council, a matter of ſo great trouble, and delay, as it ſeems moſt unreaſonable to require the aſſembling of ſuch a Council, either for this, or for much other Church-buſineſs (as hearing Appeals of leſs account. *&c.*) which come to the Patriarchs hands. And the ſame Dr. *Field* elſewhere grants ſo much; where he ſaith ||,—*That in time, cauſes growing many, and the difficulties intollerable, in coming together, and in ſtaying to hear theſe Cauſes thus multiplied, and increaſed* [which he confeſſeth before, to be juſt conſiderations] *it was thought fitter to refer the hearing of Complaints, and Appeals, to Metropolitans, and ſuch like Eccleſiaſtical Judges, limited, and directed by Canons, and Imperial Laws, than to trouble the Paſtors of whole Provinces, and to wrong the people by the abſence of their Paſtors, and Guides.* Thus Dr. *Field.*—*And the Proteſtant-Primates* (ſaith Biſhop *Bramhal* †) *uſe the ſame cuſtoms of judging Church-Cauſes, without calling Synods.* Now what is, in this kind, conceded to *Metropolitans*, much more ought to be to *Patriarchs*; whoſe Councils are not ſo eaſily collected as Provincial; nor ever was a ſet time appointed for theſe, as for the other. This ſaid, concerning the Calling of General Councils, its belonging, of right, to the Church; and, in it, to the Supremeſt Prelate.

|| p. 513.

† *Vind.* c. 1. p. 257.

3ly. It is not denied, but that the Emperor had, and, ſince the diſſolution of the Empire, other Princes joined, ſtill have a lawful power of convocating a General Aſſembly of the ſame Prelates, as being their Subjects; *of calling theſe*, both in aſſiſtance to the Church in her neceſſities; and alſo in order to their own Civil affairs, when any way diſturbed by contentions in the Church; Provided, this be with the Prime Patriarch's conſent; *conſent*, either before, or, at leaſt after, the Indiction of them. Of which

§. 49. 3.

|| *De Concil. l.* 1. c. 12. thus *Bellarmine*, || — *Catholici munus convocandi Concilia Generalia ad Romanum Pontificem propriè pertinere volunt; sic tamen, ut possit etiam aliis, Pontifice consentiente, Concilium indicere; quinetiam satis sit, si indictionem factam ipse postea ratam habeat, & confirmet, at si, nec ipse indicat Concilium, nec aliquis alius de ejus mandato vel consensu, nec ipse saltem approbat indictionem, illud non Concilium, sed Conciliabulum fore.*

§. 52. And this thing is made good by the ancient practice; where, As the *Emperors*, being, by their secular power, much more effectual promoters thereof, were prevailed with to call the *first General Councils*, so this was not done, but either from the first Motion, or with the consent, of the Bishop of *Rome*, the Supreme Head of the Church; as appears concerning all the first 6. *General Councils*, in the acclamatory speech of the 6th. Council, at the conclusion thereof, to the Emperor — *Arius Divisor*, &c. They naming 1 *Sylvester*, 2 *Damasus*, 3 *Cælestinus*, 4 *Leo*, 5 *Vigilius*, 6 *Agatho*, Bishops of *Rome*, joined with the Emperor, in the promoting all these Councils. And, to come to some particulars, Concerning the *second* General Council of *Constantinople*; thus saith that Council in their Letter to *Damasus*, and to the Council assembled with him at *Rome* — *Concurreramus* Constantinopolim, *ad vestra Reverentia* [i. e. of *Damasus* singly, this Council not then sitting, when the Orientals met first in Council, though it did, when they writ,] *literas, missas* Theodosio, *summâ pietate Imperatori*. Concerning the 3d. Council thus *Prosper (in Chronico)* — *Synodum Ephesinam factam esse* Cyrilli *industriâ, & Cœlestini authoritate*. Concerning the 4th. Thus the Emperor to *Leo*, (in the Epistles pertaining to that Council) — *Superest, ut si placuerit tua Beatitudini in has partes advenire*, &c. *Synodum celebrare, hoc facere Religionis affectu dignetur, nostris utiq; desideriis vestra Sanctitas satisfaciet, & Sacræ Religioni, quæ utilia sunt decernet. Si verò hoc onerosum est, ut tu ad has partes advenias, hoc ipsum nobis propriis Literis tua Sanctitas manifestet, quatenus in omnem Orientem, & in ipsam* Thraciam & Illyricum *sacræ nostræ Literæ dirigantur, ut ad quendam definitum locum, ubi nobis placuerit, omnes sanctissimi Episcopi debeant convenire; & quæ Christianorum Religioni, atq; Catholicæ Fidei, prosint, sicut Sanctitas tua secundum Ecclesiasticas Regulas definiverit, suâ dispositione declarent.* To which add, * that of *Pulcheria* the Emperor's Sister, to the same Pope. — *Propterea tua Reverentia, quocunq; modo prospexerit, significare dignetur, ut omnes etiam totius Orientis Episcopi,* Thraciæ *atq;* Illyrici (*sicut etiam nostro Domino piissimo Imperatori placuit*) *in unam Civitatem velociter ab Orientalibus partibus valeant convenire; & illic facto Concilio*

cilio, de Catholicâ confessione, &c. te authore, decernant. And, in the Accusation of *Dioscorus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, in the first Act of that Council—*Quòd Synodum ausus est facere sine authoritate Sedis Apostolicæ, quod nunquam factum est, nec fieri licuit*; The like to which see in the Epistle of Pope *Pelagius.* 2. to the Oriental Bishops, against *John* Bishop of *Constantinople*: And that of *Gelasius*, who lived about some 40. years after, in his Epistle *ad Episcopos Dardaniæ.—Sedes Apostolica impiam Synodum* [*i. e.* the second Ephesin] *non consentiendo, sola summovit*; *& authoritate, ut Synodus Chalcedonensis fieret, sola decrevit.* Lastly, If the ancient Canon, that in such Councils *Sine Romano Pontifice nihil finiendum*, stand good, the *calling* such Councils by *Emperors*, without the Mandate, or consent also of this *Bishop*, will be to no purpose; because nothing can be established therein, without his concurrence. Thus much of the power of *Calling* General *Councils.*

CHAP. IV.

I. Head.

Of the Generality, and just Authority of the Council of Trent.

1. *That the Western Churches, and particularly, that of* England, *are not freed from subjection to this Council, though it were not General; if, Patriarchal.* §. 53.

2. *Or, if only so General, as those times were capable of.* §. 65.

3. *That it is not hindred from being General, by reason of the absence of the Greek Churches.* §. 66.

4. *Nor by reason of the absence of the Protestant Clergy.* §. 67.

THese things touching Church-Government (from §. 40.) being premised in general, (a closer application of which shall be made to this famous Council of *Trent*, as occasion requires,) I proceed to a more particular consideration of the §. 53.

|| §. 8. first Head proposed before ||, concerning the *Generality*, and *just Authority*, of this Council, to oblige all the Churches Subjects; especially, those of the West.

I. 1. Where, in the first place, it is to be noted: That, supposing this Council of *Trent*, no legal, and free, General, yet if it be a free, and legal, Patriarchal, Council, thus it will stand obligatory (at least for the obedience of non-contradiction) to the Reformed; and particularly, to the *English* Church.

| See, before, §. 11, 12. &c. For 1st. It hath been formerly cleared, both by the *Church-Canons* ||, and the *Concessions* of *Protestants* †; That, as a Diocesan Synod is subject to that composed of many Dioceses, or to a Provincial, where the Metropolitan presides; and again a Provincial, or Metropolitan Synod, to a National, or that composed of many Provinces, wherein the Primate of the Metropolitans presides; so again is this National Synod (the Catholick Church, in many Nations, being but *One*) subject to that composed of several Nations, and their Primates, called, and presided-in, by one of the principal Patriarchs. Neither, whatever Superiority such Patriarch, *really*, hath, needeth he, for the subjection of such Primates, and their respective Churches, to this Patriarchal Council, any other power over these *Primates*, save what these Primates are granted to have over the *Metropolitans*; whose Provincial Synods, we see, are subjected to a National, or the Primate's Synod. Neither, if it could be proved, that the chief Patriarchs have over *National Primates*, no superiority of power; or at least, that some particular *Provinces*, as to *Ordinations*, or some other Jurisdictions, are utterly exempt from Patriarchal authority, may therefore such *Provinces* pretend freedom from any obedience to the Decrees of a Council *Patriarchal*, wherein some one of these Patriarchs presides; no more, than they can justly pretend freedom from a Council *Oecumenical* on the same account; in which Council Oecumenical, or General, though the same *Primates* should acknowledge no Ecclesiastical *Person* their Superior, yet could they not deny the *Council* to be so. Subject, then, are National Synods, and Churches, to Patriarchal; *and* to this end *every Church*, (as Dr. *Field* observes, *p.* 513. cited before, §. 16. n. 5.) *is subordinate to some one of the Patriarchal Churches, and incorporated into the Unity of it.* Of the necessity of which Union of Churches in *Patriarchal* Synods, in the so much more difficult, and chargeable, assembling of such, as are absolutely *Universal*, see before, §. 16. n. 4.

† §. 16. n. 4. &c.

I.

§ 54. 2. 2. Next; The *Church of* England, one of those the most antiently professing Christianity, which it is clear it did, before

Ter-

Tertullian's time ||, never pretended subjection to any other *Patriarch*, or his Council, than this of the *West*; to whom also it ascribes its *Conversion*, without dispute, as for the *Saxons*, or *English*; if not also, as for the *Britains*. And accordingly, both in ancient, and latter times, (if the *mos antiquus obtineat*, in the 6th. Canon of *Nice*, be of any force) it hath always ranged it self, and appeared, in the Western Councils, as a *Member* of this Patriarchy, and of the Latine Church; and, from time to time, concurred in the passing of those *Canons*, which have established the Authority of the *Roman* Patriarch, and of these Patriarchal Councils.

|| See *Tertullian Apol. & adversus* Judæos c. 7.--*Origen in* Ezech. *Hom.* 4, --*Bede Hist.* Angl. l. 1. c. 4.

After several Christians suffering Martyrdom here, in *Dioclesian's* time; In the *Council* at *Arles* in *France*, 10. years before that of *Nice*, assembled by *Constantine*, (who, being born in *England*, and his Mother an *English* woman, and a Christian, and, being after his Father's death, here also first declared *Emperor* by his Army, may be presumed to have had some particular respects for the *Brittish Clergy*,) we find the presence, and subscription of several Brittish Bishops acknowledged by Dr. *Hammond* ||, and B. *Bramhal* †, and of which thus Sir *Henry Spelm. A. D.* 314.— *Aderant è Britanniâ celebriores (ut videtur) tres Episcopi* [Surely, in dignity much preceding, and much ancienter than the Bishop of *Caerleon*], *nempe Eboracensis, Londinensis, & de Civitate Coloniæ Lodunensium (quæ aliàs dicitur Camelodunum) una cum Sacerdote, Presbytero, & Diacono, qui & Canones assensu suo approbabant, &, in Britanniam redeuntes, secum deferebant observandos.* The first Canon whereof setleth the matter of *Easter* to be kept, through all the Churches, on the same day; and the divulgation of this through all Churches, was committed to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, the Western, and Prime Patriarch, *secundum consuetudinem*, saith the Canon. Again, at the Council held at *Ariminum*, and before this, in that of *Sardica*, assembled, *A. D.* 347. some 20. years after that of *Nice*, is found the presence of the *Britain*, amongst other Western, Bishops, witnessed by *Athanasius*, who was present there himself, in his second Apology: And, therefore, may the Canons of that Council be presumed, among the rest, to be ratified by them; or, at least, being passed by the major part of that Occidental Council, to oblige them. Now what honour these Canons give to the *Roman Bishop*, how they allow and ratifie his supreme Decision of *Appeals*, &c. Protestants are not ignorant; and therefore, to evade it, make such exceptions as these ||—1. *That it doth not appear, That the British Bishops did assent to that Canon.* But this matters not, the major part, in Councils,

§. 55.

|| Schism p. 110.

† *Vindic. of the Church if* England, p. 98.

|| B. *Bramhal*, Reply to *S. W.* p. 24.

cils, concluding the reſt; and neither doth it appear on the other ſide, but that they did approve it; which alſo is to be preſumed, where appears no contradiction; 2 Again urged; *That it was no General Council.* But it ſufficeth for the *Britains*, if it were, at leaſt, a compleat *Occidental* Council. 3. Pleaded; *That theſe* Canons *of* Sardica *were never incorporated into the* Engliſh *Laws, and therefore did not bind* Engliſh *Subjects.* But *Church-Canons*, and *Decrees*, in matters Eccleſiaſtical, do oblige all the Members of the Church, though *Princes* oppoſe; Oblige *Princes* alſo, if Chriſtian, and ſo the Churches Subjects. And the Author that requireth this incorporation of Church-Canons into the Princes Laws, explains himſelf elſewhere ||, to mean only, that Church-Decrees oblige not, as to the uſing any *coactive* power in his Realms for the execution of them, without the Princes leave, *becauſe* (ſaith he) *ſuch external coactive Juriſdiction is originally Political*; a thing granted him; ſo that, before ſuch leave, or enrolment, the Churches Decrees oblige both Prince, and People, if Chriſtian, *in foro Conſcientiæ*, the diſobedient juſtly incurring the Churches cenſures; the thing we, here, contend for. Laſtly, *The* 9th. *Canon of* Chalced. [a ſubſequent General Council] *is pretended to contradict theſe of* Sardica, *in giving the Supremacy in Appeals to the Patriarch of* Conſtantinople. But I need not tell him, that this *Conſtantinople* Supremacy is not for the *Weſt*, but *Eaſt*, which is, for the Controverſies of thoſe Provinces there, ſubject to that Patriarch.

|| Schiſm guarded, *p.* 160.

p. 59.

p. 61.

§. 56. And from the preſence of the *Britain* Biſhops in theſe ancient Councils (if I may make here a little digreſſion) appears the ignorance of the Abbot of *Bangor* (if the Relation be true) in being ſuch a ſtranger to the *Popes* Perſon, Authority, or Titles, after *A. D.* 600. after all that power exerciſed by him, for ſo many Ages, in the Weſtern Provinces, conceded by Proteſtants (ſee Dr. *Field*, of the Church, *l.* 5. from *c.* 32. to *c.* 40.); after ſo many *miſſions*, of ſeveral holy Biſhops from the Pope of *Rome*, either to *plant*, and propagate, Chriſtianity in theſe Iſlands of *Britain*, and *Ireland*; or, to *reform* it.—* Of *Fugatius*, and *Damianus*, very early ſent by Pope *Eleutherius*, in King *Lucius* his days; which King, in the greater nearneſs of ſeveral Chriſtian Biſhops in *France*, yet addreſſed himſelf to the Pope, as the common Father of the Weſtern Church—Afterward, * Of S *Germanus*, about *A. D.* 430. ſent by Pope *Celeſtine* (ſaith *Proſper* † one who lived alſo in theſe times) accompanied with *Lupus* another *French* Biſhop, who alſo conſecrated *Dubritius*, that was the firſt Archbiſhop of *Caer-Leon*—* of *Palladius*, and *Nenius*, and *Patricius*,

|| *In Chronico.*

p. 53. 55

tus, all made Biſhops at *Rome*, and ſent thence to the *Picts*, *Scots*, and *Iriſh*: (Concerning which, ſee the Church-Hiſtory, in *Bede*, *Baronius*, *Spelman*.) — And, beſides this, * when the *Iriſh* Biſhops yielded all obedience to this *Roman* Biſhop at this very time that the *Britiſh* are ſaid to deny it; as appears, both for that they are ſaid by *Bede* ‖ (the South-*Iriſh* at leaſt) to have returned very early to a right obſervation of *Eaſter*, * *ad admonitionem Apoſtolicæ Sedis Antiſtitis*: and alſo, for that, about this time, they ſent Letters to S. *Gregory*, then Biſhop of *Rome*, to know, after what manner they ought to receive into the Church ſuch as were converted from *Neſtorianiſme*, to whom he ſends his *Orders* concerning it, directed — *Quirino Epiſcopo, & cæteris Epiſcopis in Hibernia Catholicis*, (l. 9. Epiſt. 61.) ‖ l. 3. c. 3.

§. 57. Hence alſo is diſcovered the unreaſonableneſs of the ſaid *Abbot*'s denial of his obedience to the *Pope*; or, pleading ſubjection only to the Archbiſhop of *Caerleon*, exclusive to any other ſuperior whatever. For, waving here the Queſtion, whether the Pope, by his ſingle authority, could ſubject the Archbiſhop of *Caerleon*, and his Province, to S. *Auſtin* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, (done afterward in *Henry* the firſt his time, with the approbation of Proteſtants; and therefore, which might have been done in S. *Auſtin*'s): yet *ſubjected* was this *Britain*-Clergy to the *Canons* of *Arles*, and *Sardica*, of which Councils their Repreſentatives were Members, and ſo ſubjected to the *Weſtern Patriarch* alſo, for any authority which theſe Canons declare to be inveſted in him; and from the ſame obligation of obedience, was their Conformity, in the celebration of *Eaſter*, with the reſt of the Weſtern Churches, which was required by the firſt Canon of the Council of *Arles*, in this Abbot's time, moſt unjuſtly refuſed.

§. 58. Mean while, whatever *independence* can be ſhewed to have been challenged, or Unconformity practiſed, by the Abbot of *Bangor*, and others, within the *Province* of the Archbiſhop of *Caerleon*; yet there is no reaſon, that the ſame ſhould be extended, or applied to the *National* Church of the *Britans* in General. For the firſt Archbiſhop of *Caerleon* is *Dubritius*; who, being a Diſciple of S. *German*, ſent from *Rome*; and being conſecrated Archbiſhop of this City by him, and *Lupus*, it is probable, was, for his time, conformable to the Cuſtoms of the *Roman* See; and contrary to thoſe owned in *Auſtin*'s time by theſe *Britains*: But however; This of *Caerleon* was but an Archbiſhoprick of a late erection; the 3d. or 4th. from which *Dubritius*, probably muſt poſſeſs that Chair, when *Auſtin* came: But the *Britains* had, long before *Dubritius* his time, other *Biſhops* much preeminent to *Caerleon*:

* The

* The Archbishop of *York* (the chief Bishop of the whole Nation (as that City then was the principal City, the Roman *Prætorium* being there; see *Spelm.* Appar. *p.* 22.) * a Bishop of *London*, and Bishops of some other places, appearing formerly in several Councils. Of which Bishops, *Todiacus* Archbishop of *York*, and *Theonus* Bishop of *London*, being persecuted by the *Saxons*, fled into *Wales* with their Clergy, *A. D.* 586. within eleven years after whose flight thither, *Augustine* came into *England*; and, upon it, their persecution in part ceased. Now there being no mention of any *opposition* made, by any of these Bishops, or their Clergy (which, in eleven years space, could not all be deceased) to *Austin*; but only by the *Welsh* under *Caerleon*, what can be imagined here more reasonable, than, * That they conformed to the rest of the West in such submission to *its Patriarch*, as was due to him by the Canons of those Councils, which their Predecessors had allowed; and as was rendered to him by their neighbour-Prelacy of *Ireland*, (see *Greg. l.* 9. *Epist.* 61.) as likewise. * That they celebrated *Easter* according to those Conciliary Canons, and the Roman manner; and lastly, * That returning into some of those parts of *Britain* from whence they fled, they assisted *Augustin* in the conversion of the *Saxons*.

A. D. 586.

§. 59. From the presence, then, of the *Britain* Bishop in these ancient Councils also appears the insufficiency of that Argument, which would prove the ancient *Britains* former non-subjection to, or conversion by, the Western Patriarch, or his Missives, from their having at *Austin's* arrival a different observation of *Easter* from the rest of the West.

1. For 1st. It is manifest, that they followed not the practice of their Forefathers herein: *manifest*, both, from the presence of the former *Britain* Bishops in the Council of *Arles*, which Council determined this matter; of whom Sir *Henry Spelman* saith ||, — *Qui & Canones assensu suo approbabant; & in Britanniam redeuntes secum deferebant observandos.* And also, from *Constantine's* Letter †, to persuade the *Asian* Churches to uniformity with the rest of the world in the observation of it; He naming there, among other Churches, particularly this of *Britain*; unless any will say; that, whilst the most eminent Provinces of *Britain* kept it after the *Roman* manner, yet the *Welsh*, and *Scots*, then kept it otherwise. But since S. *German*, and *Lupus*, who came hither two several times, and from whom *Dubritius*, their first Archbishop of *Caerleon*, received his education, solemnly kept their *Easter* here with the *Britain* Clergy (See *Bede, l.* 1. *c.* 20.) it follows, either that their observation of *Easter* was then altogether *Catholick*; or, that if it

|| A.D. 314.

† *Socrat.* Hist. *l.* 1. *c.* 6.

it was otherwiſe, yet, by reaſon that the difference happeneth not in every year, it was that year by theſe Biſhops not taken notice of.

§.60. 2. 2ly. It is clear alſo, That as theſe *Britains* varied from the *Roman* Cuſtom in this, ſo did they from the *Eaſter Quartodecimans* in *Aſia*; and therefore, may not, for this, be thought to have derived their Chriſtianity from thence; The *Britains* keeping their *Paſch* conſtantly on the Lord's Day; only, when the Lord's Day happened on the 14th. day of the Moon, they kept it with the *Jews*, and *Quartodecimans*, contrary to the *Roman* Cuſtom, that obſerved it, in ſuch year, on the *Sunday* following: for which, ſee *Bede*, *l.* 3. *c.* 4. & 25. 3. Laſtly, *Bede* || ſpeaks of this Error, in the *Scotch* Nation (and the ſame may be preſumed, in the *Britiſh*) *Nuperrimè, temporibus illis, hanc apud eos hæreſin exortam; & non totam eorum gentem, ſed quoſdam ex iis, hâc fuiſſe implicitos.* Which *Honorius*, and other *Roman* Biſheps with their Letters (See *Bede Ib.*) endeavoured (as ſoon as might be) to ſuppreſs. And judge you, by theſe things, how juſtifiable thoſe proceedings of the *Britain Clergy*, or *Councils* of that time, (mentioned by Biſhop *Bramhal*, *Vindic.* p. 104.) were, in oppoſition to *Auſtin* the Monk: who only required of them in this thing to follow the Tradition of the Church; and objected againſt them.—*Quòd in multis, Romanæ conſuetudini, immo Univerſalis Eccleſiæ, contraria gererent; & quòd ſuas Traditiones univerſis, quæ per orbem ſibi invicem concordant, Eccleſiis præferrent.* All which was true; and the Proponent alſo confirmed this truth before them with a Miracle, reſtoring ſight to a blind man. See Sir *Hen. Spelman*, A. D. 601. || *Hiſt. l.* 2. *c.* 19. 3.

Pardon this Digreſſion, made to abate a little the Confidence of thoſe, who would collect ſome extraordinary liberty of the *Britannick* Church from the ſuperintendency of the Weſtern Patriarch, from this *Declaration* of the *Abbot* of *Bangor*; and the *different obſervation* of *Eaſter*. Of which matter Mr. *Thorndike*, in maintaining the viſible unity of the Church Catholick to conſiſt in the reſort of inferior Churches to ſuperior; (the viſible Heads of which Reſort, he ſaith, were *Rome*, *Alexandria*, and *Antiochia*) ſpeaks thus, more moderately † —*They that would except* Britain *out of this Rule*, [of ſubjection] *upon the act of the* Welſh *Biſhop's refuſing* Auſtin *the Monk for their Head, ſhould conſider that S.* Gregory, *ſetting him over the* Saxon *Church, which he had founded, according to Rule, tranſgreſſed the Rule, in ſetting him over the* Welſh *Church.—Setting this caſe aſide, the reſt of that little remembrance, that remains concerning the* Britiſh *Church, teſtifies the like reſpect from it to the Church of* Rome: *as appears, from the Churches of* Gaul, Spain, *and* Affrick, *of which there is no cauſe to doubt, that they firſt received their Chriſtianity from the Church of* Rome.] † *Juſt meaſures*, p. 40.

§. 61.
‖ §. 55.

To proceed; and from the *Council* of *Arles*, and *Sardica*, and *Ariminum* (spoken of before ‖, to come to later times; we find the *English Bishops* either *concurring*, and presenting themselves as members, with the rest, in those Occidental Councils of a later Date, the several *Lateran* Councils, that of *Constance*, *Basil*, and *Florence*; or, in absence, *acquiescing* in, and *conforming* to, the Votes, and Acts thereof; which Acts have confirmed to the Bishop of *Rome* those Jurisdictions over the whole Church, (excepting the question of his Superiority to General Councils), or, at least, over the Western part thereof, which the present Reformation denies him. For which see the *Council* of *Constance*, (much urged by Protestants, as no Flatterer of the Pope, and wherein, the Council voting by Nations, the *English* were one of the 4.) *Sess.* 8. & 15. condemning, against *Wickleff*, and *Hus*, such Propositions as these.—*Papa non est immediatus Vicarius Christi, & Apostolorum*—*Summus Pontifex Ecclesiæ Romanæ non habet Primatum super alias Ecclesias particulares*—Petrus *non fuit, neq; est, Caput Ecclesiæ Sanctæ Catholicæ.*—*Papæ Præfectio, & Institutio, à* Cæsaris *potentiâ emanavit.*—*Papa non est manifestus, & verus Successor, Apostolorum*—*Principis*, Petri, *si vivit moribus contrariis* Petro.—*Non est scintilla apparentiæ, quòd opporteat esse unum Caput in Spiritualibus regens Ecclesiam, quod* [Caput] *semper cum ipsâ militanti Ecclesiâ conservetur, & conservatur.* Now the contrary Propositions to these, authorized by a Council supposed not General, but Patriarchal only, are obligatory at least to the members thereof; and consequently to their Posterity, until a Council of equal authority shall reverse them: As in Civil Governments, the same Laws which bind the Parents, bind the Children, without the Legislative power, *de novo*, asking their consent.

Not many years after the Council of *Chalcedon*, in the Patriarchy of *Alexandria*, there succeeded to *Proterius*, a Catholick Bishop, *Timotheus* an *Eutychian* (since which time also the Churches of *Egypt*, and *Ethiopia*, remain still *Eutychian*, or at least, *Dioscorists*): And, in the Patriarchy of *Antioch*, to *Martyrius*, a Catholick Bishop, succeeded *Petrus Fullo*, an *Eutychian*: And in the Empire, to *Leo*, an Orthodox Emperor, succeeded *Zeno*, an *Eutychian*: And all these declared their *non-acceptance* of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*: Yet this did no way unfix, with posterity, the stability of its Authority, or Decrees. Neither can the modern *Eutychians* justifie their non-submission to that Council hence, because they can produce some persons, and those Patriarchs too, that have, in succeeding times, but after a former more general *Acceptation*, opposed it.

31y.

§. 62.

3. 3ly. After the *English*, and before them, the *British*, Bishops, thus shewed §. 54. to have been subject to a *Patriarchal Council*; upon what pretence, or new priviledge since the Reformation, these Bishops should plead any exemption from submitting to the Decrees thereof when accepted by a much major part of the Church-Prelacy (an acceptation sufficient ||) I see not.

|| See before, §. 40.

1. For 1st. The Pope's calling it no way renders such a Council irregular; for it is granted by Protestants, that the Calling of a Patriarchal Council (though not of a General) of right belongeth to Him; neither may the Bishops of such Patriarchy justly disobey his *Summons*; or secular Prince hinder their journey †.

† See before, §. 16. in. 5.

2. 2ly. Neither can the absence of the Eastern Bishops, here, be stood upon: because their presence, not necessary in such a Council.

3. 3ly. Nor can the secular power, under which such Protestant Bishops live (especially whenas no Heathen, but himself also a Subject of the Church), opposing, or not-accepting such a Council's Decrees, free the Church's Subjects in his Dominions from observation thereof; (I mean, if such Decrees be in matters purely Ecclesiastical, and spiritual, and no way intrenching upon his Civil Rights, of which enough hath been said formerly.)

§. 63. Bishop *Bramhal*'s Plea, That such Decrees oblige not any Prince's Subjects, till by him incorporated into his Laws, as if Christians were to obey no Church-Laws, unless first made the King's, hath been spoken to before ||: Dr. *Hammond*'s grand Plea, on which he lays the greatest weight for securing the Reformation (See his Treatise of Schism, *c.* 6, 7. *p.* 115, 132, 137, 138, 142.) *viz.* the Prince's power and right to translate Patriarchies; to remove that of *Rome* to *Canterbury*; helps not, at least in this matter; (nor perhaps did he ever mean it should extend so far, as to exempt any Western Nation from all subjection to a *free Occidental* Council).

p. 54.

|| §. 55.

For 1st. He grants; That the Prince can do no such thing, so far as it thwarts the Canons of the Church: See Answ. to Schism Disarmed, *p.* 164. —*A Power* (saith he) *Princes have to erect Metropoles*, [and hence he collects, new Patriarchs]; *but, if it be exercised so, as to thwart known Canons, and Customs of the Church, this certainly is an abuse.* Which he hath the more reason to maintain in this particular, because he is in some doubt (as appears in his Answer to *S. W.*†) whether Princes do not hold such power of translating, or erecting Patriarchs from the Church's Grant. Now surely this will be confessed contrary to the Church's Canons for a Prince to make such a removal of the Patriarchs former Jurisdiction, as thereby to null,

† Answ. to Schism Disarmed, *p.* 174.

as to his Subjects, the authority of a Patriarchal Council. And, if, indeed, the erecting, and removing Patriarchs did originally belong to Princes, yet, since the Civil Governments that are contained within the Precincts of one Patriarchy, are now in the hands of many several Soveraigns, the repeal of any Patriarch's former authority, as it relates to the convening of such Councils, must be an act at least of the *Major part* of these Princes; as being a thing, which equally concerns them all; Nor can the Doctor produce an instance of a former fact in this kind. And, if the Prince can thus free his National Clergy from a Patriarch, and his Synod; why not also from a General Council; that neither it shall oblige his Subjects without his consent? Again; Doctor *Heylin's* Plea ‖ touching the *English* Clergy, in their Reformation, their conferring all their power on the Prince, which they formerly enjoyed in their own Capacity; & *power* (saith he) *not only of confirming their Synodical acts, not to be put in execution without his consent; but in effect, to devolve on him all that power, which formerly they enjoyed in their own capacity* [comparing it there to the Roman Senat's transferring all their power on *Cæsar*], I say, this Plea, as it contains very strange Doctrine; so it reacheth not our present matter; for, if a National Clergy can, at pleasure, transfer their own *spiritual authority* over others, and that authority too for *reforming Errors* in matters of *Religion*, to a *Lay* person, or also to his Delegates; which authority was intrusted to them, by our Lord, in a *Personal Ordination*; yet can they not hence transfer to the same Lay-person, their Superiors whether persons or Councils, *spiritual* authority *over them*, so that this Superior's authority, for the future, shall not oblige, but when such Lay-person first admits it.

‖ *Reformation justified*, p. 84.

§. 64. This (from §. 53.) of Obedience due, from the Reformed, and particularly from the Church of *England*, to the Council of *Trent*, if this were only a free, and Legal, Patriarchal Council. The true Rights of which also it may not be thought to forfeit by its further pretensions to be a Council Oecumenical; As we may not withdraw our due obedience from our Prince, when he exacts some other not due; or withhold a just debt, where more is unjustly demanded: But not to stay here;

§ 65. 2. 2ly. Our Obedience may, yet further, be rightly challenged to this Council, as *General*: if it shall be proved, though not so General, as several formerly have been; yet, so General, as now, in such an alteration of States, can be had; and it being such,

ſuch, the ſame divine aſſiſtance, as to ampler formerly, may be preſumed to be afforded to it, for ſuch Controverſies as are neceſſary to be decided. And a ſubmiſſion to a Council only ſo comprehenſive ſeveral Proteſtant Divines think reaſonable. Thus B. *Bramhal*, in Preface to Reply to *Chalced.*—*I ſubmit my ſelf to the Repreſentative Church, a free General Council, or ſo General, as can be procured.* And *Schiſm-guarded*, p. 136.—*There is nothing* (ſaith he) *that we long after more, than a General Council rightly called, rightly proceeding; or, in defect of that, a free Occidental Council, as General as may be.* And *p.* 351.—*I ſhall be ever ready to acquieſce in the determinationof a Council ſo General, as is poſſible to be had.* See more, in *Diſc.* 1. §. 35. Dr. *Field* freely confeſſeth ||—*That the Decrees of Popes, made with the conſent and joint concurrence of the other Weſtern Biſhops, do bind the Weſtern Provinces that are ſubject to him, as Patriarch of the Weſt.* [Bind them ſo, as that theſe have no liberty to contradict the judgment of the Patriarch, and his Council, as appears, *Ib. d.* 39. *p.* 563. Where he quotes the Emperor's Law, (*Novel.* 223. *c.* 22.) confirming the 9th. Canon of Council *Chalced.* —*Nullâ parte ejus ſententiæ contradicere valente*: Conſequently, theſe Councils bind ſo the Church of *England*. Dr. *Hammond* ſaith †—*That General Councils are now morally impoſſible to be had, the Chriſtian world being under ſo many Empires, and divided into ſo many Communions, that it is not viſible to the eye of man, how they ſhould be regularly aſſembled.* But mean while he ſaith ||—*We acknowledge the due authority of our Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, profeſs Canonical obedience to them, ſubmit to their Cenſures, and Decrees; and give our ſelves up to be ruled by them in all things, ſecundum Deum.* And, (Anſw. to *Cathol. Gentleman*, p. 17.) —*A Congregation* (ſaith he) *that is fallible may yet have authority to make deciſions, and to require Inferiors ſo far to acquieſce to their Determinations, as not to diſquiet the peace of that Church with their contrary opinions.* [All which ſeems to amount to his acknowledging an external obedience of non-contradiction at leaſt, and ſuch, as Proteſtants contend for to their National Synods, to be due to a Patriarchal, or the higheſt, Aſſembly of Church-Governors which the preſent, or future times, in the moral impoſſibility of having General Councils, are capable of.

|| *Of the Church* p. 557.

† *Anſw. to Catholick Gent.* p. 30.

|| *Of Schiſm*, c. 9. p. 163.

§. 66. 3.

3ly. The abſence in it of the Repreſentatives of the Eaſtern Patriarchs, and Churches, (the thing principally urged) ſeems no juſt hinderance why this council of *Trent* may not be ſtiled

led *General*. For evidencing which, I desire you to consider with me these Reasons, in part cleared before.

1st. That a Council may be stiled *General* without the presence in it of some considerable Churches ||; either, 1. When these, called by a lawful Authority, by reason of poverty, and distance of place, or persecution, *&c.* cannot come; and afterward, acquainted with the Councils proceedings, express no dissent to the Acts thereof. See before, §. 36. the four first Councils, as convened for the suppressing of Heresies that chiefly afflicted the Eastern parts, so mostly consisting of Oriental Bishops, scarce any of the West being present in some of them. Or 2. When invited, and no way justly letted, they refuse to come; Or 3. When, by some former General Council condemned of Heresie, and Schism, they are not invited at all to come; or, coming, are repelled. For the Church Catholick may be much narrower than Christianity †: and Councils are General, and obligatory as such, if they consist of the Church Catholick, though it should be reduced only to one Patriarchate.

|| See before, §. 36, & 43. 1.

† See before, §. 39. 2.

2ly. Concerning the Calling of the Eastern Churches (not entring here into that Controversie, whether these Churches do not maintain an *Heresie* in the Procession of the H. Ghost, and become by this disenabled, and deprived, of a Vote in Councils, ‖ or, are not guilty of a *Schism*, at least since the accord made in the Council of *Florence*) it appears; that both in the first assembling of this Council at *Trent*, by *Paul* the Third, and again, at the renewing of it by *Pius* the Fourth, in general, all Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, *&c.* who by Law, or priviledge, have voice in General Councils, were invited and called to it; for so ran the Bulls of the Indiction of it: (See *Soave's* History of the Council of *Trent*, *l.* 1. *p.* 101. & *l.* 5. *p.* 435.)

‖ See before, §. 43.

3ly. There was an actual war, for a great part of the time of this Council, between the Christians, and the Turks; wherein *Charles* the Fifth twice invaded *Affrick*; once victorious, and once beaten; during which War, we may guess how hard, and dangerous a thing it would have been for these Eastern Bishops, or Patriarchs, in the Turkish Territory, to have resorted to any Assembly, either in his, or in his Enemies, Dominions; *It is not credible* (saith B. *Bramhal* †) *that the* Turk *will send his Subjects, that is, four of the Proto-Patriarchs, with their Clergy, to a General Council; or allow them to meet openly with the rest of Christendom in a General Council; it being so much against his own Interest.* But had there been peace; yet, in so great *distance*, and so great *poverty* of those Churches, their assistance, in any great number, could not have been expected; neither is it probable, in the diffe-

3.

† *Schism Guarded*, p. 352.

differences they have with the *Roman* Church (though the chief points concluded in *Trent* againſt Proteſtants are none of theſe) that they would have truſted the negotiation of their affairs to a few. And, upon ſuch conſiderations as theſe, I ſuppoſe it was, That the Reformed, in the Articles they propoſed to the Emperor, || concerning a free Council to which they would ſubmit, require not this preſence of the Eaſtern Churches, or Patriarchs in it, as a condition of their ſubmiſſion to it; for indeed, in ſuch a conjunction of affairs, as was then, this would have diſcovered in them a plain tergiverſation. || *Soave, l.* 7. *p.* 642. & 367.

4. But 4ly. Since the Diviſion, that cauſed the convening of this Aſſembly, aroſe only in the Weſt, and did not diſturb at all the peace of the Eaſtern Churches, who were, for the moſt of the points controverted in this Council, againſt the new Separatiſts, united in opinion, amongſt themſelves, and with the Weſtern Churches; there is alſo, from this, a fairer apology to be made for their abſence, and little reaſon to put them to ſo great a trouble, and charge.

5. 5ly. Though theſe abſent, their judgment concerning the matters decided in this Council *againſt* the *Reformed*, excepting a very few, though not delivered in any Provincial Synods, then called for that purpoſe, which Synods in ſuch a deſolation of that Church could then hardly be convened, yet is ſufficiently manifeſted, both in their publick Liturgies, and other modern Writings, and alſo, for ſeveral points, in former Weſtern Councils, wherein the Repreſentatives of theſe Weſtern Churches have appeared to have agreed with it. Of which, ſee what is ſaid in *Diſc.* 1. §. 34. — & *Diſc.* 3. §. 158, *&c.* Eſpecially ſee the Anſwer of *Jeremias* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, returned about ſome ten years after this Council of *Trent* was ended (I think, I may ſay, by God's ſpecial Providence) to the *Wiremberg* Divines (where the Reformation firſt began): who ſent to him the *Auguſtan Confeſſion*; and invited him to an union of their two Churches; and, to induce him the eaſilier to it; profeſſed their acceptation, together with the Greek Church, of the ſeven firſt General Councils. [their words are || — *Illam, quæ à Sanctis Apoſtolis, & Prophetis, & Spiritum Sanctum habentibus Patribus, ac Patriarchis, & ſuper divinas Literas ædificatis ſeptem Synodis, tradita eſt, fidem amplectentes.* To whom He † — *Reſpondebimus ergo, nihil noſtrum afferentes; ſed ex Sanctis ſeptem Oecumenicis Synodis (quas & vobis probari rectè ſcribitis), & ex ſententiâ Sanctorum,* &c.] Unto every Article of which *Auguſtane* Confeſſion, the Patriarch returned his Judgment as conſonant to other modern Greek Writers, ſo ſcarce in any thing differing from the Tridentine Decrees. || *Acta* Theol. Wirtemb. *Epiſt.* † 1. *Reſponſ.*

After this firſt aſſault made upon the Greek Church by the new

new Reformation, thus repulsed by the Patriarch *Jeremy*; In later times, by the diligent Negotiations of some Protestant Agents there, the Reformed Tenents made a second fair appearance in the East, and sollicited an Acceptation of them in the Greek Churches, and had prospered so far, as that in *A. D.* 1629, *Cyril Lucar*, first, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and then, of *Constantinople*, published a Confession of Faith, in several points, though somewhat obscure'y, favouring *Calvinism*, and opposite to the Decrees of *Trent*; which Confession he set forth, as owned, not only by Himself, but the whole Greek Church. But, upon this second Alarm, as it were, given unto the *Greeks*, no sooner was this *Cyril*, by a violent death, removed out of the Chair, but his immediate Successor, *Cyril ab Iberia*, in the same year 1639. assembled such a Synod, as, in such a posture of things, could well be procured, at *Constantinople*; wherein were also present the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and of *Jerusalem*, and 23. Bishops: and again, his Successor *Parthenius*, A. D. 1642. convened another, wherein were 25. Bishops; and amongst these, the Metropolitan of *Moscovy*, both which Synods pronounced *Anathema* to *Cyril Lucar*; declared his *Confession Calvinistical*, and excommunicated all those, who by word, or writing, should own, or defend it: In which Synods also, against the Articles of this Confession are justified several of those Tenents, which were before decreed, against the Reformed, by this Council of *Trent*: and namely these; 'Transubstantiation, or a Corporal Presence of Christ's Body and 'Bloud with the Symbols; Invocation of Saints; Veneration of 'Sacred Images; Prayer, and Alms, for the Faithful Deceased with 'Repentance, as betterable in their present Condition, by them; 'Free-will; the Seven Sacraments; Church-Infallibility, *&c.* ||. Again, by occasion of a late Controversie happening in *France* between *Anton. Arnauld* a *Sorbon* Doctor, and Mr. *Claude*, a *French* Minister on this Subject, many more Testimonies, bearing a very late Date, of several Prelates, and other Clergy have been, (upon sollicitation,) receiv'd out of the East, all conspiring with the Decrees of this Council, as to the Points, they had occasion to speak of, such as be those forenamed; to which may be added, 'Adorati-'on of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, Evangelical Coun-'sils, Monastick Vows, the Churches Hierarchy, *&c.* See a diligent Collection of them in D. *Arnauld's* Answer to *Claude*, l. 4.— and in the Appendix to his Book, *l.* 12. And indeed such an Eye to, and Reverence of, the Orientals had the Council of *Trent*, that, in several passages, it seems to take great care, * of Anathematizing any such Doctrines, as were in those parts commonly received,

|| *See* Leo Allatius, *de perpetuo consensu, l.* 3.---Arhould's *Ans. to* Claud. *l.* 4. *c.* 7.

(Of

(Of which, see something below, §. 186.) or, of giving them any occasion to protest against it. This said of the absence of the *Greeks*;

§ 67. 4. 4ly. Neither doth the *absence* of the *Protestant-Clergy* hinder this of *Trent* from being a *Lawful* and *obliging*, *Patriarchal*, or also *General*, Council. 1. First; Not the *absence* of so many of them, as were no *Bishops*; because they had no right to sit, or vote there; if we may be suffered to model that of *Trent* according to *former* General, and approved, Councils. 1. 2. Nor the *voluntary*, and *un-necessitated* absence of such of them as were *Bishops*; though those of a whole Province, or Nation, be so absent; if *invited*; if *secured* (as the Protestants were: See below, §. 92, &c.) and yet not coming. For (as hath been shewed) in Councils, as the *Vote*, so the Presence, of some Bishops from a *major* part of Christian Provinces, and a like *Acceptation* of its Acts after the Council concluded, is sufficient to nominate the Council *General*, and render its Acts obliging; or else farewel General Councils, and their power. For, these being ordinarily assembled for the rectifying of some part peccant, when will not such Bishops as are *heterodox*, fearing some censure, or ill success, from the rest out-numbring them, purposely *absent* themselves? or, such *Princes*, as are any way obnoxious (as *Hen.* 8. was, having assumed a new Church-Supremacy) not prohibit them? Of this, thus Archbishop *Laud*, §. 27. n. 4.—*Such a promulgation, as is morally sufficient to give notice, that such a Council is called, is sufficient in case of Contumacy; and, where they, who are called and refuse to come, have no just cause for their not coming.* And D. *Field* || forbears not to pronounce the 5th. Council held at *Constantinople* || p. 651. under the Emperor *Justinian*, A. D. 553, *General*: when as yet the *Prime Patriarch*, and his *Western* Bishops, were neither *present* in it, at least any considerable number of them; nor, in absence, had *approved* it; *General*; *i. e.* in case (saith he) of their wilful refusal. See his words set down before, §. 43. Some other cause therefore must be urged, and not this barely of their absence, why the Council is not without them Legally General, or obliging. 3. Nor doth the *involuntary absence* of some *Bishops*, if hindered by some secular power, or also, if not admitted, or excluded, by the Council, hinder it from being *Legitimate*; if the excluded be proved such, as profess, and own, those Opinions, that have been *condemned*, and the defenders thereof anathematized, by *former* lawful Councils. 3. Now whether the Protestant party might justly have been excluded upon this Title, see below, §. 198. Nay further; For those Bishops, who are not yet condemn-

ed by any former Church-Decree; yet, if they be *accused*, or *suspected* of some new dangerous Errour, it hath not been unusual, in former allowed Councils (the major part thereof so agreeing) to deny them the liberty of *sitting*, or giving their *vote*, therein, till first, by the judgment of the Council, they be cleared of it. For which see the Proceedings against *Dioscorus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and his chief Adherents in the 4th. General Council, *Act.* 1.

§. 86. n. 1. Yet, notwithstanding such just pretensions of excluding the Protestant Divines from the Council of *Trent*, *de facto* they were not so. But had granted to them, — *Plenissimam securitatem* (as their Safe-Conduct, *Sess.* 18, expresseth it) *Veniendi, proponendi, loquendi, — Articulos quoslibet tam scripto, quam verbo liberè offerendi, eosq; Scripturis Sacris, & Beatorum Patrum Sententiis, & rationibus, astruendi — ad objecta Concilii Generalis respondendi*, &c. (See also that Safe Conduct, before this, *Sess.* 13.) And some Protestant Divines appeared in this Council upon such *security* ||. But behold, within three Weeks after their arrival there, the Protestant Princes, that had sent these to treat, here, an *Union* of Religion, and the *Peace* of Christendom, appear in *Arms*; on a sudden, invade the Emperor, secure, and wholly unprovided; and narrowly saving himself from their Hands, by flight from *Ispruck*, at midnight. And their victorious Armes, now not far distant from *Trent*, and a rumor spread, that they would suddenly possess themselves of the *Alpes*, to hinder the entrance of forreign Forces, struck the Council with such a terror, that they were necessitated to suspend it, for some time, and seek their safety by a dispersion of their Members: Nor did the Council, by reason of the tumults in *Germany*, and wars in *Italy*, and *France* †, meet again, till ten years after this, in the beginning of *Pius* the fourth; after that the *Reformed Religion* had received an incredible growth in those troublesom, and distracted times; wherein, by the Emperor's being constrain'd to grant a *Toleration*, the Evil One had much more advantage to sow his Tares (as also, at its first birth, Protestantism was cherished with a like Toleration, by reason of the *Invasions* of the *Turk*, and the Aids, against Him, necessary from the Protestant party). No sooner had *Pius* renewed the Council, but there was another *Safe Conduct* for Protestants published, like that under *Julius*, but not made use of.

|| See *Soave*, p. 374, 375.

† *Conc. Trid. Bulla cel brat. Conc. Sess.* 17.

§. 68. n. 2. But let us, now, suppose the Council undisturbed in the manner before related, and these Protestant Divines that came to the Council, still continuing there, and indulged not only 1 the freedom of *Disputing*, but 2 their *Decisive Vote*, [Touching which thing

thing see the Caution premised by the Council ||; That, if, for that time, the Protestants were permitted to give a *Placet*, it should be no prejudice to the Rights, or Honour of the present, or future, Councils; which shews the Council not resolved to deny this to them, if much stood upon]; Yet what least advantage (to repeat here again something said already in the first *Disc.* §. 36. n. 3.) could Protestants have extracted from these? For the first; their *Freedom* of *Disputing* and perswading: What could they now have said, after a thirty years Growth of their Doctrine, that they had not formerly written, and the Council perused? And with what face could they have declined the exposition of *Scriptures*, by former Ecclesiastical *Tradition*, *Councils*, and *Fathers*, by which they were cast? For the latter; their power of *Voting*: What signified their number to that of Catholick Bishops? Or, if the Votes were changed from *Personal*, to *National*, still less relief to them from hence; especially, if such Nations be considered, in a due proportion, according to the multitude of their Clergy. Which the Protestants well discerned, when waving any such trial, *i. e.* of *Ecclesiastical* matters by *Ecclesiastical* Judges, they proposed rather a Decision by *Laicks* indifferently chosen in an equal number, on both sides, † By which bargain, they were sure not to lose their Cause, if only those nominated by them, did not *vote* against them. Was it not then a much wiser course to forbear coming to this Council at all, and to plead it *non General* by their *absence*, when as the proceedings thereof could no way have been defeated, or changed, by their presence? This, for the *Absence* of the *Protestant* Clergy.

|| *Apud Binium, Conc. Trid. Sess.* 15.

† *See Soave, p.* 369.

CHAP. V.

§. *That this Council is not hindred from being General, by the absence of the Roman-Catholick Bishops of some Province, or Nations,* §. 69.

Where

1. *Of the reason of the Paucity of Bishops in some Sessions,* §. 70.
2. *Of the Ratification of the Acts of these Sessions by the fuller Council under* Pius, §. 75.
3. *Of the Acceptation of the whole Council by the absent Prelacy,* §. 77. *And particularly: Concerning the Acceptation thereof by the* French *Church, Ib.*

§. 69. 5. 5ly. Neither doth the *Absence* of many of the Roman *Catholick Bishops*, or of the Bishops of some one Roman-Cathol. Prince (provided, there be a personal presence of some Bishops, authorized from a major part of Cathol. Princes), hinder this Council from being lawfully *Patriarchal*, or *General*, for some of the Reasons given but now, (§. 67.) To which may be added these further *Considerations* to remove any prejudice raised to this Council from the paucity of the number of Bishops in it (especially in some Sessions) in comparison of some former General Councils.

§. 70. 1. 1. The first *Consideration* is, That, this Council, beyond any former, having so many *Points* of *Doctrine* and *Discipline* to examine, wherein the Reformed contradicted the immediate-former common tradition, and practice; and being drawn out for so long a time; beginning in 1545, and ending in in 1563; actually sitting for some four years, it cannot rationally be expected; that such a *frequency* of Bishops should continually attend it, as if it had been convened for deciding some *single Controversie*, and suddenly concluded. But, in so long a Service, much complaint there was (especially amongst the poorer sort) of their great expences

pences; more, of the neglect of their ſeveral Churches; and after a while, great longing after their own Country, Relations, Houſes; and therefore, frequently, ſome ſtealing away from the *Council*, without the leave, and conſent, of the reſt.

§. 71. 2. 2. That, whereas the Council ſeveral times complained, (eſpecially in the fourth, fifth, and ſixth Seſſions) and intended to proceed to Cenſures, againſt the Biſhops that were abſent, (in which Council the greateſt ſcarcity was of the *Biſhops* of *France*, and *Germany*,) at ſeveral times both the *French* King's, and Emperor's, Embaſſadors *excuſed* their abſence to the Council, for ſome time at leaſt, from the neceſſity there was to retain them at home, for the defence of the Catholick Religion, againſt the endeavours and tumults, of the *Calviniſts* in *France*, and of the *Lutherans* in *Germany*. See *Pallav.* l. 5. c. 15. n. 5.—l. 6. c. 16. *Soave*, p. 509. 552.

§. 72. 1. For the *French* Biſhops; 'tis true, that three of them only attended the beginning of the Council, the Archbiſhop of *Renes*, the Archbiſhop of *Aix*, and another. One of which (*Renes*) returned upon the King's Summons, before the firſt Seſſion of the Council; but more Biſhops from time to time were promiſed to be ſent from thence, (ſee *Soave*, p. 143); and, after ſome time, were ſent, when the Council, for fear of the Plague, was removed from *Trent* to *Bologna* ||. And in the time of the Council's ſitting afterward at *Trent*, under *Pius* the Fourth, the King of *France* ſent thither the Card. of *Lorraine*, and 14. Biſhops, who ſate in Council, and 18. ſelect *Divines*, moſt of them *Sorbon-Doctors*, maintained there at the *King's* charge †.

|| *Spondan. A.D.* 1545. n. 17.—*Pallavic.* l. 6. c. 1. n. 10.—l. 10. c. 7. n. 2.—c. 2. n. 6.

† *Pallav.* l. 18. c. 17. n. 21.

2 As for the *German Biſhops*; becauſe in the beginning of the Council it was thought neceſſary, that they ſhould be detained at home, at leaſt many of them, to defend the Roman-Catholick Cauſe, in the frequent *Diets* there; and becauſe, in *Pius* his time, they were partly terrified with the threats of *Hoſtility* upon their Eſtates from the *Proteſtants*, then very powerful, if they ſhould offer to go to *Trent* (as the Emperor's Embaſſadors in the Council pleaded for them), therefore there was not ſo great an appearance at any time of them in the Council, though nearer than many others; and they were diſpenſed with to appear by *Proxies*; though indeed it was, for ſome Reaſons, denied to all Proxies, (non-Biſhops), to have in the Council any *definitive* Vote ||. But mean while, theſe *German* Prelates, in their ſeveral Treaties with the Proteſtants in theſe *Diets*, without yielding any thing to them, that was contrary to the Conciliar Acts (for which ſee the Relation made by *Soave* of theſe Diets) do ſhew a con-

|| *Pallav.* l. 5. c. 15. n. 5. l. 7. c. 13.—l. 20. c. 17. n. 7.—l. 23. c. 5. n. 4.

concurrence, in all points, of their *judgments* with the others, who ſate in *Council*.

§. 73. 3. That open diſcords and *wars* breaking out, ſeveral times, between ſeveral Princes, during the ſitting of this Council, eſpecially between the Pope, and the Emperor, and King of *France*; as likewiſe *Civil wars* between the *Lutherans*, and *Catholicks*, in the ſame Prince's Dominions, hindred, ſometimes the *Biſhops* of one Nation, ſometimes of another, from attending the Council. The Princes alſo upon another account *ſent not*, or *recalled* their Biſhops, as they had ſome Differences with the Pope; or feared, that their ſecular intereſt might any way ſuffer in the Council.

See the *Emperor* reſtraining his Prelates from the Council when tranſlated from *Trent* to *Bologna*, upon pretence of the place too remote, for ſetling the affairs of *Germany*, and for the convenience of the German Biſhops, (who had ſo great Charges,) their repairing thither. (*Soave*, p. 274.) But ſee the true cauſe (*Soave* p. 261,) if we may believe him; where he ſaith,—*The Emperor* [Charles 5.] *was much diſpleaſed at this Tranſlation of the Council, becauſe he ſaw a weapon* [*i. e.* the Council] *taken out of his hand* [*i. e.* from *Trent*, which City was in his power]; *by managing whereof, according to opportunity, he thought to ſet Religion at peace in* Germany, *and ſo to put it under his obedience.*

So, ſee the King of *France*, *Hen.* 2. in *Julius* his time, with whom he had a conteſt about *Parma*, proteſting againſt the Council in *Trent*, and refuſing to ſend his Biſhops thither, upon pretence, that they could not paſs ſafely, neither through the Pope's Territories, with whom he had war; nor through the Emperor's, a Confederate with the Pope (*Soave*, p. 319, 320.) But ſee the true Cauſe (*Soave*, p. 315.)—*The King hoping, that ſuch Proteſtation againſt the Council would remove the Pope* [from his reſolutions concerning *Parma*]: *and the fear of ſuch diſturbance to the proceedings of the Council make him yield the controverſie about* Parma. Which Controverſie laſting for ſome time longer, and the Council at *Trent* being diſſolved within a year, by reaſon of the *Proteſtants* in *Germany* taking *Arms*, hence no *French Biſhops* were preſent in the Council for its Seſſions under *Julius*. *But this proteſtation of the King, and abſence of the French Biſhops, the Imperialiſts* (ſaith Soave, p. 320.) *eſteemed a vanity; becauſe the Act of the major part of the Univerſality is ever eſteemed lawful, when the leſſer, being called, either cannot, or will not be preſent.* Yet, he ſaith, *that the Parliament of* Paris *was of a contrary judgment*, viz. *that in Eccleſiaſtical Aſſemblies, where the whole belongeth to all, and every one hath his*

his part, the assent of every one is necessary; Et, prohibentis conditio potior, and the absent, not giving their voices, are not bound to receive such a Council. In answer to whom, *Pallavicino* ‖ as easily denies, that *Parliament* to have said, or held, any such thing, as applied to *Ecclesiastical affairs* (else in a possession, wherein there are many partners, or sharers, this rule is very true): But whatever that Lay-Parliament held; it is so exploded a conceit, this, [that the assent of *every one* is necessary, or else the *major* part of the Council doth not oblige him; by which no *Arrian* Bishop is obliged to obey the Council of *Nice*] that I count it lost time to confute it. ‖ *l.* 11. *c.* 18. *n.* 7.

See, again, the French King, in *Pius* the Fourth's time, upon the Council's beginning to agitate the *Reformation* of *Secular* Princes, as to their infringing the priviledges of the Church, giving order, that his Bishops should absent themselves from the Council; but the King, being better informed by the Card. of *Lorraine*'s Letters to him, and those Articles of *Reformation* of *Princes*, because so offensive, being no further proceeded in, the *French Bishops* withdrew not themselves, save some few, upon their private occasions; but continued in it, till the end of the Council †. † *Pallavic. l.* 23 *c.* 1.--- *Soave, p.* 783, 784, 798.

§. 74.

4. That in those Sessions, wherein there were but *few* Bishops, as in the fourth, fifth, sixth Sessions under *Paul* the Third, yet there was besides them a choice *Collection* of other *Divines*; some of the most famous for Learning, and Writings, which that age afforded; which *Divines*, though they had no *decisive Votes* in the Session; yet were they constantly consulted with, in the preparatory *Congregations*, and nothing ordinarily passed without their preceding Conferences, and long, and diligent disquisitions; such I believe, as cannot be matched in the Records of any former Council. See * the manner of their proceeding in *Soave*, p 198. and † the testimony he gives them, *p.* 150.—*That, though, at the first, they seemed in the Council only to make Sermons, &c. yet, when that controverted Doctrines were to be decided, and the abuses of Learned men, rather than of others, to be reformed, their worth began to appear.* Likewise, beside these Bishops, and other Divines in *Trent*, there was also, in the time of the forenamed *Sessions*, a great number of *Cardinals*, *Bishops*, and choice *Divines*, and *Canonists*, at *Rome*, assisting the *Pope*, and consulted by him, upon all new occasions of informing his *Legates* in *Trent*. So that, even in the meaner attendance of the Bishops in this place, it was not so contemptible a Conventicle, as many would make believe. Nor are the persons, then Resident, and acting in the Council, so much *vilified* by one side, but that they are as much *exalted* by another.

Thus

Thus *Soave* falls upon that part of the Council, which ſeems moſt weakly guarded, the *Fourth Seſsion*, in his *p.* 163.—*That ſome thought it ſtrange; that five Cardinals, and forty eight Biſhops, ſhould ſo eaſily define the moſt principal and important Points of Religion, never decided before.*—*Neither was there amongſt thoſe Prelates any one remarkable for Learning, ſome of them Lawyers, perhaps Learned in their Profeſsion, but of little underſtanding in Religion; few Divines, but of leſs than ordinary, ſufficiency; the greater number Gentlemen, or Courtiers; and, for their Dignities, ſome only titular; and the major part, Biſhops of ſmall Cities: particularly of* Germany *not ſo much as one Biſhop, or Divine.* So *Soave.*

And *Pallavicino* gives him this repulſe, *l.* 6. *c.* 17. *n.* 12, &c.—*That what the Biſhops then ſaid in the Congregations, which is to be ſeen in many other Libraries beſides the* Vatican, *ſufficiently ſheweth their great Learning. That there were only* 48. *Biſhops indeed, but theſe not of ſmall Churches, as* Soave *ſuppoſeth. Beſides that every one of the Cardinals (beſides* Poole*) had noble Biſhopricks; and moſt of them, more than one, as was uſual in thoſe days. But, which is more, that theſe Prelates were choice perſons out of* Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, France, *and* Spain, *ſent thither by the Supreme Authority. Beſides whom there were ſome from* Dalmatia, Greece, Sweden, Scotland. *That the three Legates were all excellent perſons, and two of them greatly ſkilled in the Learned Languages* [to the ignorance of which Tongues *Soave* imputes the paſſing of the Determination made in that Seſſion, in behalf of the vulgar Tranſlation] Cervini *eſpecially; who then, from time to time, communicated his doubts with* Sirletus, *then Keeper of the* Vatican *Library, afterwards Cardinal; beſides the Legates,* Madruccius, *and* Pacecus, *were of the greateſt, and moſt renowned perſons, that were in* Germany, *or* Spain. *To theſe Biſhops were adjoyned three Abbots to repreſent the* Benedictine *Order, and the five Generals of the* Mendicant *Orders, all men of great Learning, as* Soave *frequently, though againſt his will, confeſſeth, in his recitations of their Diſcourſes; and (if we make any account of the perſons repreſented by them), it was no ſmall matter, that, in this Council, beſides others, were, then, the Heads of almoſt all the encloyſtered Families, who are ſo conſiderable a part of the Church, and, in fine, the chief Conſervatory, and Receptacle of Theology.*—*There aſsiſted this Synod at that time, for Counſellors, at leaſt forty Divines* [‖ *See Soave, p.* 194.] *of the ableſt that were then in Chriſtendom, and many of whom have illuſtrated that Age with their Writings, and much exalted it, for Theological Learning, above many preceding.* [Such were *Soto, Oleaſtro, Caterino, Caſtro, Vega,* &c.] *It is true; that there were no* Germans *there: But what marvel, if theſe Prelates came not to the Council,*

Council, who were then in a fight; at that very time a Diet being held; and, a little before it, the Colloquy at Ratisbone. *For whose sakes therefore it was, that* Madruccius, *and* Toledo, *Cesar's Embassadors, opposed the Accusation, in the Council, of the contumacy of the Absents. Yet were the matters of the Council conferred with these* German *Prelates by* Letters; *and their Answers read, and the aids of their Pen, though not of their Tongue, afforded to the Council.* Thus the *one* exalts, as the *other* depresseth. The Discourses, which are set down in these two Historians, as likewise the Writings of several of them now extant, may best inform you of their Abilities. As for the matters decided in this 4th. Session, though *Soave* represents here the people of *Germany* as much *aggravating* them; yet, as if he had forgotten himself, in the next page || he brings in the Pope as much sleighting them, and admonishing his Legates—*That they should not spend time in matters not controverted, as they had done in those handled the last Session,* [i. e. the Fourth] *wherein all agree, that they are undoubted Principles.* The Decision, therefore, only of points amongst *Catholicks* universally received, as it had not, so needed not, the *confluence* of so great a *Body*. || p. 164.

5. But, 5ly. Let the *paucity* of the Bishops there, or the *absence* of the Representatives of some whole *Nation Catholick*, be never so prejudicial to the Acts of some former *Sessions* of this Council under *Paul*, or *Julius*; yet an amends is made for it in the times of *Pius*; when a much fuller body of *Fathers* (in all, of those who subscribed in the end of the Council, 255. the *Seven Generals* of the Religious Orders and the *Seven Abbots*, being included) and amongst them, a *Mission* of *Bishops* from those Catholick *Princes*, who were formerly deficient (and these Bishops assisted with a very great number of the most Learned Divines, selected out of all Christian Countries, and Religious Orders, the Catalogue of whom is printed at the end of the Council.) did *review* and *ratifie* all, that those fewer had formerly *enacted*; and by their reading first, and then subscribing to, the Acts of the whole Council from the beginning thereof, 1545, added that strength to those Acts, which they may be thought, from such a *paucity*, formerly to have wanted. Of which *Ratification*, even by the French among the rest, thus *Soave*, p. 804.—*Afterward a Proposition was made for the Reading, in Session,* [the last Session] *of all the* Decrees *made under* Paul, *and* Julius, *to be approved; which* Modena *opposed, saying; it would be a derogation to the authority of the Council of those times, if it should seem that the things then done had need of a new confirmation of the Fathers; and would shew,* §. 75. 5.

that this and that was not all one, becauſe none can confirm his own things. Others ſaid, it was neceſſary to do it, for that cauſe, that authority might not be taken from them, by ſaying they were not of the ſame Council. And the ſame Frenchmen, who before did ſo earneſtly deſire, that it might be declared, that the Council was new, and not continuated with that under Paul *and* Julius, *did now labour more than others, that there might be taken away all cauſe of any doubting, that all the Acts from the year* 1545. *until the end, were not of the ſame Synod. Thus it happeneth, as in humane Affairs, ſo in Religion alſo; that one's credulity is changed with his intereſt. Therefore now all aiming at one mark, it was determined, ſimply to read them and ſay no more; for ſo the unity of the Council was moſt plainly declared; and all difficulties removed, which the word* [*Confirmation*] *might bring, leaving every one to think what he liſted, whether the reading of them did conſequently import a Confirmation, or Declaration of their validity; or an inference, that it was* one *Synod, which made, with that, which read, them*; [and therefore, being owned as Acts of the *ſame* Body, they needed no more confirmation in the 25th. Seſſion thereof, than the Acts of the 23*d.* or 24*th.* Seſſion did.] Here then we ſee, either *confirmed*, or *owned*, thoſe Acts were by all, none oppoſing any of them as erroneous, or faulty; and then; the controverſie, whether they were thus approved and acknowledged, as the acts of one, and the ſame Council; or, as the Acts of ſeveral; (as the Emperor ſignified to his Embaſſadors, *apud Pallav.* l. 24, c 8. n. 7.) is not much material. [And indeed, the former indeavours of the *French*, not *Prelates*, but *Miniſters* of *State*, as alſo, of the Emperor's, at the firſt opening of the Council under *Pius*, That this Council then might not be declared a *Continuation* of the former Council, was not at all from any Diſlike of the former Decrees: But partly; that by this the Proteſtants (whoſe reduction theſe Princes much intended) might not be diſcouraged from appearing in this Council under *Pius* ||; and the *French* alſo partly, for maintaining the honour of the *Proteſtation* of the *French* King, *Henry* 2. againſt the ſitting of this Council under *Julius*: though this alſo out of no quarrel to any thing done in the Council, then, but, the pretence of no ſecurity in ſending his Biſhops to it, by reaſon of the *Pope's* warring upon *Parma*, which he endeavoured by all means to divert. †] *After this* [ſaith *Soave*, p. 813] *the Secretary going into the midſt did interrogate, whether in the name of the Council a Confirmation ſhould be demanded of* Pius *of all things decreed under* Paul, Julius, *and His* Holineſs. *And they anſwered, not one by one, but all together,* Placet. So ſaith *Soave*. But *Pallav.* (l. 24. c. 8. n 8.) proves by ſeveral

|| *Soave*, p. 434. --*Pallav.* l. 15. c. 1. n. 6.

† *Soave*, p. 315, 321, 819.

veral teſtimonies, that the Votes were here given, as uſually; one by one: One only, the Archbiſhop of *Granata*, a *Spaniard*, diſſenting, as holding the Acts of the Council valid without any further *confirmation*. And the great unanimity of the Council, when drawing toward an end, is elſewhere ſufficently intimated by *Soave*, p. 782. a little before the 24th. Seſſion, where he ſaith — *Here I muſt make a great mutation of ſtile. For whereas in the former Narration I have uſed that which is proper to deſcribe variety of mind's and opinions, one croſsing the deſigne of another*, &c. *hereafter I muſt make relation of one aim only and uniform operations, which ſeem rather to fly, than run, to one only end*, &c.

§. 76. Here then we ſee this *numerous* Body of *Biſhops* (exceeding that, which hath been convened in ſeveral former Councils, confeſſedly General) 1 Rehearſing, 2 Subſcribing-to, 3 Requeſting from the *Chief Paſtor* of the Church Catholick a *Confirmation* of the *Decrees* of the Council; not only thoſe laſt, under *Pius*; but the former, under *Paul*, and *Julius*, from the beginning; they not particularly re-voting indeed thoſe former Decrees, leſt ſo thoſe ſhould ſeem the *Acts* of *another* Body (the reaſon given for it); but acknowledging them rather, as their own *Acts*; and themſelves, the ſame continued Body with thoſe, that made them: and in this, the *French Biſhops* as forward, as any: and all this teſtified by *Soave*; no friend to the Council. And, after all this, is it not ſtrange, that any one ſhould attempt to perſwade his Reader ||, that theſe Biſhops indeed, uſing ſome Artifice, cauſed the former Decrees to be read, but did not *ratifie*, or *accept*, them? But ſomething was neceſſary here to be ſaid for thoſe inconſiderating perſons, with whom ſpeaking laſt ſerves for an Anſwer; ſince this *Ratification* clears that main Objection made by Proteſtants againſt the *paucity* of Biſhops in ſome of the former *Seſſions*; *clears it*, I ſay, by that common Rule owned alſo by Proteſtants themſelves †: *That in caſe, ſome Biſhops be not preſent from ſome Churches, whether Eaſtern, or Weſtern* [at the making of the Decrees]; *yet if, upon the publiſhing thoſe Decrees, they be univerſally accepted, that doth, ex poſt facto, make the Council* [I add, or any Seſſion thereof] *truly Oecumenical*. Yet, in the laſt place I need not tell you, that, the *Articles* made under *Pius* alone, from Seſſion 17. to its Concluſion, the ratification of which is here not queſtioned, are ſo *many*, and ſo *principal*, as that theſe utterly ruine the Reformation, though the reſt of the Council, for the paucity of the Repreſentatives, were caſſated. Amongſt theſe Decrees are, *The lawfulneſs of communicating only in one kind*; *Celibacy of Prieſts*; *Invocation of Saints*; *Veneration of Images*; *Celebration*

|| See *Mr. Still. Rat. Acc.* p. 456.

† *Stillingfl.* p. 536.

lebration of the Divine Service in a more generally-unknown Tongue; the Aſſertion of, Purgatory; the Sacrifice of the Maſs; and ſeveral others.

§ 77. 6. Or 6ly. If this Council under *Pius* alſo ſeem not ſufficiently numerous; becauſe more than half of them were *Italian* Biſhops; yet the full *Acceptation* of this Council afterward, by the Biſhops of thoſe Nations, who had ſometimes none, and other times but few, Repreſentatives in it, ſufficiently repairs this defect alſo. See before, §. 36, 37. Now amongſt all thoſe Catholick Churches, the *Acceptation* of the *French*, is only that which can be doubted of. And, concerning this, you may obſerve,

6.

5. 1ſt. That the Council was approved by the *whole Roman-Catholick* Clergy of *France*, as well thoſe *abſent*, as thoſe *preſent* in the Council. See for this the many Petitions, made at ſeveral times, by the whole Clergy aſſembled, to the King, that he would receive it, like the reſt of Catholick Princes; ſet down in *Review of Council Trent*, l. 1. c. 2. There, 1576. the Archbiſhop of *Lyons*, in a General *Aſſembly* of the *States* holden at *Blois*, doth, in the name of the State Eccleſiaſtical of *France*, ſpeak thus unto the King; —*They moſt humbly deſire you, that, according to their more particular Requeſts exhibited in their Remonſtrances, you would authorize, and cauſe to be publiſhed the holy and ſacred Council of* Trent, *which by the advice of ſo many Learned men, hath diligently ſought out all that is neceſſary to reſtore the Church to her primitive ſplendor. Wherein (Sir) they hope and expect from you, as a moſt Chriſtian King—the aſſiſtance of your authority, to put this Reformation in execution.* [where you ſee the Clergy approved the Articles of *Reformation*, as well as *Doctrine*.]: Again, 1579, in a like Aſſembly of the Clergy at *Melun*, the Biſhop of *Bazas* in their name, ſpeaks thus to the King.—*The Clergy entreateth your Majeſty, that it may be lawful for them by your authority to reduce Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, & reform themſelves in good earneſt. Amongſt all the Rules of Reformation & Diſcipline they have pitched upon thoſe which were dictated by the Holy Ghoſt, and written by the Holy Council of* Trent, *in as much as they cannot find any more auſtere and rigorous, nor more proper for the preſent malady, and indiſpoſition of all the members of the Body Eccleſiaſtical: but chiefly becauſe they are tied and bound to all Laws ſo made by the Catholick Church, upon pain of being reputed Schiſmatical againſt the Catholick Apoſtolick Church of* Rome, *and of incurring the Curſe of God, and eternal damnation. Wherefore the Clergy doth moſt humbly beſeech*, &c. A. D. 1582. The Archbiſhop of *Bourges*, Delegate for the Clergy in this cauſe, ſpake at *Fountain bleau*, in this ſort: *The Council of* Trent *is received, kept, and obſerve*

observed by all Christian Catholick Kings and Potentates, this Kingdom only excepted: which hath hitherto deferred the publication and receiving of it, to the the great scandal of the French Nation, and of the title of Most Christian, *wherewith your Majesty and your Predecessors have been honoured. So that under colour of some Articles touching the liberty of the Gallican Church (which might be mildly allayed by the permission of our H. Father the Pope) the stain and reproach of the crime of schisme rests upon your Kingdom amongst other Countries. And this is the cause why the Clergy doth now again most humbly desire, &c.* A. D. 1585 the same request was renewed in the name of the Clergy assembled in the Abbey of *St. German, in Paris. Not the Gallican only, but the whole Church Catholick doth summon, intreat and pray you to receive it* [*the Council of* Trent] *No good Christian can or ought ever to make any question, but that the H. Ghost did preside in that company, &c. There intervening the authority and command of the holy See, the consent of all Christian Princes, who sent their Ambassadours thither, who staid there till the very upshot, without the least dissenting from the Canons and Decrees there published: There being such a number of Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, and learned men from all parts; yea, not a few Prelates of your own Kingdom, sent thither by the late King your Brother, who having delivered, consulted and spoken their opinion freely, did consent and agree to what was there determined.* And (since the writing of the Review) *A. D.* 1614. in a General *Assembly* of the *States* at *Paris*, Cardinal *Perron*, and Cardinal *Richlieu*, then Bishop of *Lusson*, prosecuted again the same request: And though this without success; yet, of the solemn *Acceptation* of this Council the next year after, at least by the *Representatives* of the Clergy, thus *Spondanus* || —— *In Generali conventu Cleri Gallicani Lutetiæ habito, quod ille nunquam hactenus a Regibus obtinere potuisset frequentissimis precibus, neque etiam in ultimis Comitiis* [1614] *quamvis & nobilitas vota sua junxisset, viz. Ut sacrum Concilium Tridentinum Regia authoritate promulgaretur in Regno, præstitum, a Cardinalibus, Archiepiscopis, Abbatibus, ac cæteris, qui aderant ex cunctis Regni provinciis Delegatis viris Ecclesiasticis, extitit, quantum in ipsis fuit; dum scilicet unanimi omnium consensu illud recipientes, suis se functionibus observaturos promiserunt, ac jurarunt.* After the same Author had said before in the vindication of his own Country || —— *Non solum non in Decretis Fidei, ac doctrinæ ab Hæreticis controversa, ullum unquam fuisse objectum dubium: Sed & ipsa Decreta Reformationis, tam ab ecclesiasticis susceptafuisse, quam etiam, paucis quibusdam exceptis* [chiefly those Decrees hindering the gratifying Ministers of State with ecclesiastical

|| *In* A. D. 1615 n 7

|| A D 1546 n 4

ecclesiastical commendams] *Singillatim Regiis Constitutionibus recepta, & per Ministros Regios executioni mandata.* These I have transcribed, to shew you the French Clergies conformity to this Council, high esteem of it, and reiterated intercessions for it to the King, and to the State; who in Ecclesiastical matters, I think, ought to take them for their *Guides*, and for their *Judges*.

§. 78. 2. 2. Next; That this Council was opposed by the King, or Civil State of *France*, not for any Decrees concerning the matters of *faith*, or *doctrine*, but of *Reformation*, as containing in them something contrary to the *Liberties* of the Gallican Church; or rather of the King in, or over, the Gallican Church; Whilst (I say) there was no exception taken at any point of doctrine; [For that point of the *Popes Superiority* to a Council, opposed by the French, was not decreed at all in *Trent*; whatever *Ferieres* (in *Soave* p. 818.) saith to the contrary; nor do the words there urged by *Ferieres* imply so much; nor those, most addicted to the Pope, pretend so much. Nay, *Pallav.* 24 l. 14. c. 12. n. saith, that Pope *Pius*, having nine parts of ten in the Council ready to vote this *Superiority*, yet suffered this controversie to rest undetermined, because of the dissent of the *Cardinal* of *Lorraine*, and the *French* Bishops] Here, then, the reformed cannot plead any disobligation to the Council for these things, wherein the Council is generally accepted by so great a part of the Church, || because that in some other things, it is, by some particular State, refused.

|| *See. below*, §. 147.

§. 79. 3. 3. Again, That those 13. Articles, drawn up concerning *reformation* of *secular Princes*, set down by *Soave*, p. 769. which, upon his Embassadors complaint, occasioned the *French Kings* Protestation, but gave offence likewise to the *Emperour*, and the *Kingdom* of *Spain*, *&c.* || were, upon this resentment of Princes, laid aside; and all that was enacted by the Council, in stead of these, concerning Princes, is contained in the 20 *cap.* of *Reformation*, in the last *Session*.——*Cupiens Sancta Synodus*, &c. Where you may see, with what great modesty and respect the Council treateth these Secular Suprems——*Admonendos esse censuit, confidens, eos*, &c. ——*Propterea; admonet Imperatorem*, &c.——But so it is, that had they prosecuted the former 13. *Articles* that were drawn up, such thing seems not deprived of a plausible excuse; for that there was nothing proposed in them, but what was formerly contained in the Imperial Laws, as Cardinal *Morone*, the Popes Legat in the Council, assured the Emperour (See *Pall. l.* 23. *c.* 4. *n.* 6.) and as is expressed in the Preface to those Articles (See *Soave*, p. 769) and, for that they only admonished suprem Princes to cause their

Soave, p. 760.

inferiour

inferiour Magiſtrates (againſt whom was their chief complaint, for their infringing the Churches Immunities †) to obſerve the former grants of the Secular Powers, made to the Church; which Grants ſome conceive, after a *free donation* of them, cannot be at pleaſure reſumed; eſpecially when confirmed to the Church, many of them, by a decurrent practiſe from the times of the firſt Chriſtian Emperours. What paſſages, in the Council, eſpecially in the two *laſt Seſſions*, as infringing the *rights* of *Princes*, were excepted againſt by the Kingdom, or Parliaments of *France*, you may ſee (for it would be too tedious to recount them here) in *Soave* p. 819. &c. and you may ſee the defences, in behalf of the Council, returned to them by *Palavacin* in *l.* 24. *c.* 10. and, concerning Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction in temporal matters, *l.* 12 *c.* 3. As for that particular, urged by *Soave* and others, of the Councils depriving thoſe Princes of their States, who ſhall allow Duels; That clauſe in it [*Quod ab Eccleſia obtinent.*]—*Juriſdictione, & Dominio civitatis, caſtri, aut loci, in quo, vel apud quem, duellum fieri permiſerint quod ab eccleſia obtinent, privati intelligantur*, ſhews this privation limited to thoſe places, where the *Church* hath the *Temporal* Dominion. But, mean while, where ever is ſuppoſed either a publick concurrence, and conſent of the ſecular powers to ſuch an Act of the Church, or a former grant made by them of ſuch Priviledges, and Rights to the Church, here ſuch Act of the Church cannot be juſtly cenſured, and (to uſe *Spalatenſis* ‖ his words concerning the third *Capitulation* in the *Lateran* Council under *Innocent* 3. which is alſo much agitated) —*Legitimum erit, ſi ſupremorum Principum conceſsione tacita, vel expreſſa, editum fuerit.* Laſtly, ſince many of thoſe regal rights, mentioned in *Soave*, and pretended to be violated by the Council. were not *peculiar* to *France*, but *common* to it with all other Princes, it is moſt probable; that, had the Council bin faulty therein, other Princes would have reſented ſuch wrongs, and remonſtrated againſt them, as well as *France*; For they did ſo againſt thoſe 13. *Articles*, which were afterward laid aſide; but yet, nor they, nor their Embaſſadors (vigilant, and exceptious, enough in other matters) who then attended the Council, and unanimouſly aſſented to theſe Acts, diſcerned in them any ſuch violation; and we may much rather conclude them *juſt*, becauſe the *Emperour*, *King* of *Spain*, and many other *Princes*, accepted them; than *unjuſt*, becauſe one *King* or *State*, refuſed them; And from finding the cauſes of the French State, rejecting the Council ſo ſlight, perhaps it was, that *Hen.* 4. at his reconcilement, promiſed with an oath to Pope *Clement* 8. to uſe all his endeavour,

† *Pallav. l.* 22. *c.* 6. *n.* 1.

‖ Seſſ. 25. *c.* 18. *de Reform.*

‖ De Repub. Eccleſ. *l.* 6. *c.* 10. *n.*

deavour, that this Council might be in his Kingdom entirely received || and Cardinal *D'. Ossat*, his great Councellor, and manager of his affairs at *Rome*, often writ in behalf of the Council, both to Secretary *Villeroi*, and to the King himself. —*That he found nothing in the Council opposit to the Kings Authority.* —*Many things benefitial, none contrary to the Gallican Church; unless some one perhaps may think Simonies, and other abuses, and faults, to be priviledges of the Church Gallican.* —*That it displeased the great ones in* France, *because thereby they were not permitted to enjoy Benefices, incompatible, and with such other abuses, as were prohibited by the Council.* See his Letters to *Villeroi*, Feb. 15. 1597. — And — *Mar.* 31. 1599. — And — *May* 16. 1600. quoted in *Pall l.* 24. *c.* 10. To which I may add what *Caterina de Medicis*, Q. Regent of *France* had urged before this, to the Pope's Nuncio || —*That the Council could not be admitted; because by the Councils decrees, the King could not thereafter gratifie such Ministers of State, as had done him singular service with the means of Religious Houses, or other Benefices of the Church, holden in Commendam.*

|| Sponda. A. D. 1595. n. 9. Pallavic. 24. c. 10. n. 15.

|| Pallavic. *lb.* c. 11. n. 2, 4.

CHAP. VI.

6. *That the Generality of this Council is not prejudiced, by its being called by the Pope,* §. 80.

7. *Nor by Reason of,*

1. *The pretended Non generality of the Summons,* §. 82.

2. *Or, Non-freedom of the Place,* §. 83.

3 *Or, the want of Safe conduct.* §. 92.

Where, concerning the Doctrine imputed to the Roman Church, That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, §. 93. *And of the practice of the Council of* Constance. §. 101.

6. §. 80.

6ly. THis said (from, §. 66.) That there is no prejudice done this Council, for its bearing the Title of *General*, and its obliging as such, from the absence of Bishops, *Oriental*, or *Occidental*, *Protestant* or *Catholick*; or also from the very *small numbers* of the Bishops present in some Sessions; considering so plenary a *post-acceptation* of it, as hath been shewed.

Next; Neither seems this any just exception against it, that it was *called* by an Ecclesiastical Person, the *Prime Patriarch*, the

the *Bishop* of *Rome*. In defence of which perhaps that may suffice, that is said before at large. §. 47. *&c.* But here it is to be added: That this Council was called by him, after, First, having had the *consent* (both as to the place, and time) of the *Emperour*, and all the other *Christian Princes*, except those, that were *Protestants*, and *Henry* the Eighth; who, being a much minor part of these Princes, were either to be concluded by the contrary vote of the rest; or I see not, since that *Christianity* is divided amongst so many Soveraign, and Independent, States; and no *Heresie*, or *Schisme*, can be so molestful to the *Church*, as to need the Remedy of a *General Council*, save such, as first finds patronage from some Christian Prince, I say, I see not, how any such Council can ever be lawfully convened; because, if every such *Prince* be allowed a *negative* voice herein against the rest, there will never be wanting some *Prince*, or other, *extravagant* in matters of *Religion*, (as *Henry* 8th was, then, obnoxious for his new assumed Title of *Supreme* in *Spirituals*; and the Protestant Princes, for many other Innovations) and so such Prince also averse from the meeting of such a Council, wherein he foresees, that his party will be much the weaker, and over-voted.

Called then, this *Council* was by the *Pope*, but not without the consent of the Emperour, and the most of Christian Princes; (nay, if we may believe *Soave*) not without their great *solicitation*, and *importunity*, necessitating him to call it, against his own inclinations; as if he much dreaded some effect thereof prejudicial to his present greatness. Especially, for the later part of it, held under *Pius*, and confirming all the rest that had passed before, *Soave* saith || — *That the actions of this Council were then in a greater expectation than in the former times, in regard all* Princes *had agreed in demanding it, and sent Embassadours to it; and also, that the number of Prelates then assembled were four times as many as before.* *Called* also by him it was; but after the Protestant Princes had declared a great necessity thereof; and after that both *Luther* himself, and his followers, had often, from the justice of the *present* Church-Governours, appealed to it. † All which considered, and supposing that all other things stand right; That neither the *necessity* of such a Convention at this time can be denied; nor the *place*, we weighing a general convenience, justly excepted against: Nor, that any persons are called to this Council, save *such*, and also all *such* called to it, as have been the usual constitutive Members of all other former allowed General Councils: nor any new *rule*, or way, proposed to be observed in this Council, but that which hath been formerly from the very begin-

§. 81.

|| l. 6. p. 539. 554.

† *Soave*, p. 8. 12.

ning of the firſt General Councils (which propoſal made to the Proteſtants by the Pope, then calling it, See in *Palavic.* l. 3. c. 13.—And in *Soave* p. 65: Nor the Pope, or the Biſhops conſtituting it, become any other way *a party* in this, than they have been formerly, in them; nor the lawful, and Canonical *freedom* of its Members appear any way abridged by any precedent Oath, or Ingagements made to the Pope, or others; nor the want of a *ſafe conduct*, and freedom of acceſs, and receſs, can be juſtly complained of; I ſay, all theſe offences voided, and their circumſtances abſtracted from, I ſuppoſe, the ſimple allegation of this *Council* its being *called* by the Pope will not be thought by Proteſtants the juſt ſubject of any quarrel; and therefore leaving this ſpoken of before † I proceed to the conſidering of the other particulars, ſo many of them as ſhall need any Diſcuſſion.

† § 47. &c.

7. Next then, as this Council is not hence to be eſteemed as any way defective, from its being called by the Pope; eſpecially, when this done with the concurring conſent of the *much-major part* of *Chriſtian Princes*; So neither are any of theſe, The *non-generality* of the *Summons*; or the *non-freedom* of the *Place*; or the want of *ſafe-conduct*; juſtly pretended, for the condemning of this Council as illegal, and non-obliging.

7. §. 82.

1. For firſt, 1. *For the ſummons and invitation*, ſee in *Soave* p. 101. how *univerſal* it was in *Paul* the thirds time, who began the Council; and again, how *punctual* it was in *Pius* the Fourths time, who renewed the Council; * In his ſending ſeveral *Nuncio's* (inviting them to it) to all Proteſtant Princes, and States, and, amongſt the reſt, to *Elizabeth*, the Queen of *England*, which made B. *Bramh.* (Reply. to *Chalc.* p. 352.) ſay—*As we have in horrour the treacherous, and tyrannical, proceedings of* Paul *the Third*—*So we acknowledge, with gratitude, the civilities of* Pius *the Fourth*; * In his ſending alſo an invitation to the Greek Church under the Chriſtian Emperour of *Moſcovy*; and *Baptiſt Romanus* a Jeſuite to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, to invite him to the Council † (which Jeſuit brought from thence the Arabian copy of the *Nicene* Canons, in number 80.) and *Soave* acknowlegeth, † that ſome deliberation there was of ſending, and granting a ſafe-conduct, unto the Greek Churches under the Turk.—*But it was preſently ſeen (ſaith he) that theſe poor men, afflicted in ſervitude, could not, without danger, and aſſiſtance of mony, think of Councils.*

† *See the Preface to the Acta Concil. Nicæn.*

‡ *p* 482.

See the part cular perſons ſent to theſe Princes, and the ſucceſs of their Embaſſies, in *Soave*, *l.* 5. *p.* 435, 439. 440.

Where

Where alſo he ſaith, that — *Although the Pope was put in mind, that to ſend Nuncii into* England, *and to Princes elſwhere, who do profeſs open ſeparation from the See of* Rome, *would be a diſreputation to him; yet he anſwered, that he would humble himſelf to Hereſie, in regard that whatſoever was done to gain ſouls to Chriſt did become that See. For the ſame reaſon alſo* [ſaith he] *he ſent* Canobius *into* Polonia, *with deſign to make him to go into* Moſcovy, *to invite that Prince and Nation to the Council, though they have never acknowledged the Pope of* Rome. Now here note one thing, which I ſhall have reaſon to apply to many other particulars, and ſhall often remember you of, That, if the Acts of *Pius* the Fourth, if the proceedings of that Council in his time, be juſtifiable, though thoſe of, and under, *Paul*, and *Julius*, ſhould be proved ſome way faulty, the number of Prelates inſufficient, their deciſions factiouſly carried, *&c.* yet this Tridentine Council will ſtand univerſally in force, as to all the decrees thereof; becauſe this Council under *Pius* reviewed, and ratified, and made their act, all the Decrees made before (with what ſuppoſed defect or culpableneſs of their proceedings you pleaſe, for that may be right, that is not done rightly) under *Paul* and *Julius*. So that who ſo juſtifieth this Council, ſave only for *Pius* his times, doth ſomewhat more than what is neceſſary

2ly. *For the place*, I deſire theſe things may be conſidered. 2. §. 83. 1.

1ſt. That no *place* can be choſen any where ſo abſolutely free, but that he, under whoſe temporal Dominion it is, may infer ſome violence to the Council, or to ſome party therein, with whom he is offended; and ſo, whereas the Church and the Pope, as well as Temporal Princes, have their *rights* and priviledges which may be violated, the place of the Council, in any *Secular State*, may ſeem not free enough for the *Pope*, and the *Church*; and again, ſince the Secular Princes have often differences, and ſeveral intereſts (as it happened frequently in the time of the Council of *Trent*) the place of the Council in ones Dominions will not ſeem free enough to another. Unleſs it may be thought a ſufficient remedy for ſuch (unavoidable) inconvenience, that, when ſuch violence appears, the Council may ceaſe acting, or be ſuſpended, or diſſolved; or injured States withdraw from it their Biſhops.

2ly. That the place of former Councils, appointed at *Rome*. or in ſome other City in *Italy* (as it was in the *Roman*, *Lateran*, *Florentine*, *Piſan*, Councils) was not accounted therefore to render §. 84. 2. 3

them not free, because of the nearer influence from Pope, though in all those Councils, there was something to be decided, wherein the Popes judgment stood not in *æquilibrio*, but was inclined more to one side, than another; and wherein one side might pretend him a *Party*; as in the controversies of the *Waldenses*, of *Berengarius*, of the *Grecians*, &c.

§ 85. 3. 3ly. That the *Emperour* took sufficient care, that this Council should not be convened in any place of *Italy*, which was under the Temporal Dominion of the Pope: or, where himself had not the chief command. He consented indeed, that the Council should be kept in *Mantua*; but see what he declared first to the Protestants concerning this place (in *Soave l.* 1. *p.* 80.) —*That the Duke thereof was vassal to the Empire, so that the Pope had no power there; and that, if they desired any further caution, himself was ready to give it them.* To which they answered; how rationally, I leave it to you. —*That no safe-conduct could there free them from danger, for the Pope having adherents throughout all* Italy; *who bitterly hated them, there was great danger of treachery, and secret plots.* † And, as little reason, as these, had *Henry* the Eight, to protest against the Council at *Mantua* for fear of the Pope.

† See *Soave*, *p.* 77.

§. 86. 4. 4ly. That the Pope had indeed no reason to allow the Council to be kept in any City of *Germany*, that was near the Protestants; not, to avoid their pleas, but, * for fear of their Arms (of which fear whether he had any just cause, we shall see more by and by;) as likewise * for the too great distance from *Rome*, whereby he could not so easily, from time to time, give directions to his *Legats* in those many controversies, which were likely to be agitated in that Council; and, in all which, it was impossible for him to give them a precedent information, with a sufficient foresight.

§ 87. 5. 5ly. That this Council was celebrated in a place, to which the Emperour and the major part of Christian Princes, namely all the Catholick, gave their consent, and sent (some sooner, some later) their Bishops and Embassadours too, which was enough to legitimate it, though perhaps they would rather have chosen another; and not all, the same.

[See *Soave p.* 101—and *p.* 702. Where, the King of *France* desiring a translation of the Council from *Trent* to *Constance*, *Wormes*, &c. for the more convenience of the *Dutch*, *English*, and part of the *French*, Prelats, *Soave* reports the King of *Spain* returning this answer.—*That the Council was assembled in* Trent[illegible] *all the solemnities, with* consent of all *Kings, Princes, and at* [illegible]*nce of* Francis *the French King*; *that the Emperour had superiority*

ſuperiority in that City, as in the others, that were named, and might give full ſecurity to all, in caſe the former ſafe conduct were not ſufficient.]

§. 88. Again celebrated in a place confining on *Germany*; and nearer to the *Proteſtants* there, than it was to the *Catholicks* of *France* or *Spain*; and of which the Emperour was the chief Lord.

§ 89. [Therefore *Soave* (p. 309.) repreſents the Emperour diſcourſing thus to the Proteſtants concerning this City. — *That they ſhould leave all to his care, who knew how to handle the buſineſs; that they ſhould ſuffer other Nations to meet, and that himſelf would go in perſon, if not thither, yet to ſome near place, and would take order, not by words, but deeds, that all ſhould paſs with good terms. And* (below) *that he, as Advocate to the holy Church, and Defender of the Council's, will do what belongeth to his charge, as he hath promiſed.* And (p. 669) relates — *How the Cardinal of* Lorraine *ſent a Gentleman to the Emperour to deſire him, that he would not remove further from the Council in regard of the fruit which they hoped forby means of his vicinity, which will keep every one in his duty, and hinder the attempts of thoſe, who would tranſlate it into another place, &c.* And (p. 302.) relates the Popes fears — *That he could not take all ſuſpicion from the King of* France, *if the Council ſhould be celebrated in* Trent, *a place ſubject to the Emperour, and near unto his Army.*]

Again, a place it was, * not acceſſible by the *Popes Forces*, unleſs marching firſt through anothers Dominions, and treſpaſſing on the Emperour, who was in *Italy* it ſelf a Prince much more powerful than he; and, a place, which either the Emperours or Proteſtant Forces might at any time ſurprize with a much ſhorter march. And therefore was not the Pope free from fears, concerning it (though he had more of *Germany*) as may be ſeen in *Soave*, *l.* 5. *p.* 436., where he ſaith. — *That the Pope was troubled, becauſe the Proteſtants of* Germany, *unto whom a great part of* France *was united, would demand exorbitant things which he could not grant them, — and doubted they might be able to diſturb the Council with Arms, — that He confeſſed, that the dangers were great, and the remedies ſmall, and was perplexed and troubled in mind.* Thus *Soave.*

§. 90. Nor were his fears groundleſs, as you may ſee, if you pleaſe to view (in *Pallavic.* Hiſt. *l.* 8 *c.* 5. and in *Soave* p. 203.) what fright the Council was put in, A. D. 1546. under *Paul*, 3. by the Proteſtant army, having taken *Chiuſa*, and drawing near to *Tirol*; and again yet more, A. D. 1552. under *Julius* The third. The more particular relation of which, though mentioned before, is worthy your knowledge.

† As

†See *Spondan. A. D. 1562. ---Soave, p. 374. &c ---Pallavicin. l. 13. c. 3.*

† At this time several Embassadors from *Protestant Princes* came to *Trent*, desiring a *safe-conduct* for their *Divines*; being very serious in this business, as the Council supposed, who suspected nothing of a War intended: of which *safe-conducts*, one, and a second drawn up (how full and punctual I desire you but to peruse it, as set down in *Soave, p* 370 or in *Conc. Trid. Sess.* 15.) yet pleased them not, because not containing also in it those *conditions* which they required to be observed in treating their controversies, one of which conditions was, *that the holy Scriptures only should be judge.* Yet upon this Conduct, about the middle of *March*, came some Protestant Divines to *Trent*: four from *Wirtenberg*, and two from *Argentina*, who exhibited a Confession of their Faith, and then earnestly desired a conference with the Divines of the Council about those controversies; which conference was, for a little while, delayed, by reason of the sickness of the Popes Legat (of which sickness he died within a few weeks) and, for that the Council had not as yet determined the manner, and form, of their treating with them. Now this being the only *appearance*, that ever the Protestants made in the Council *By this* (saith *Soave*, p. 362) *both the Emperour, and the Electors, were assured, that* Maurice *the Duke of* Saxony, *though there were great levies made of Souldiers, did not attempt any thing of war.* But, whilst this was acting at *Trent*, the Protestant Princes, having secretly made a League with the French King, were preparing a suddain invasion upon the Emperour secure, and suspecting nothing; and when the time came to play their mine—*The* Saxon *Embassadors* (saith *Soave*, p. 374.) *went secretly out of* Trent, *and returned home divers waies:* but when their Divines departed, he mentions not.

The Protestants arms prosper, the surprized Emperour being able to make little, or no, resistance; they take *Ausburg*: and afterward *Ispruck*, some three dayes journey from *Trent*, the Emperour with his Court flying out of it at mid-night in great confusion; and thus, the danger drawing so nigh *Trent*, the Bishops fly away, and the Council is dissolved the 28 of *April*, not daring to stay till the appointed time of the Session, the first of *May*; and the sick Legat carried thence to *Verona*, where, within three dayes, he died.

Now from the coming of the *Protestant Divines*, which was about the middle of *March*, till the Protestants appearing in arms, and besieging *Ausburg*, which was on the first of *April*, and so putting the Council in a fright, was not above *a fortnight*; and yet see what a complaint *Soave* (p. 375.) makes.—*How these Protestant*

Proteſtant Divines were delayed from time to time, not admitted to diſpute, not to be heard, glad to divulge printed copies of their Confeſſion, becauſe the Legate concealed it. By this you may ſee, how *unfree* this place was to the *Proteſtants*, and how *ſecure* for the *Catholicks*, by vertue of the *Popes* great power there. See again in *Soave*, p. 779 the fears of the Council. A. D. 1563. upon the Emperours being ſick; as from whom they had their Protection, and whoſe ſafe conduct expired with his life.

§. 91. 6. 6. Laſtly: The Councils oppoſing the Pope ſo conſtantly, in ſome (though not Proteſtant) points; and their great unanimity in their condemning moſt of the Proteſtant tenets, ſhew the place ſufficiently free; for, where there is compulſion uſed there would appear ſome reluctance.

§. 92. 3. 3ly. For the *Safe conduct*. It was granted, when deſired, to the *Proteſtants*, for the ſecurity of their perſons, as full, as could be demanded. The clauſe put in the firſt Safe-Conduct (which you may ſee in the Council, *Trid. Seſſ.* 13.) [*quantum ad ipſam ſanctam Synodum ſpectat,*] is excepted againſt, in *Soave* † as if not involving the Pope; but, beſides that the Proteſtants might have had the Popes Safe-conduct if they pleaſed, but they omitted, and probably diſdained, to ask any ſuch thing: beſides this, I ſay, this Safe-conduct was ſubſcribed by his Legat in his ſtead; and what could the Proteſtants fear, when the Pope had there no ſecular Power, and when the Council, for any other ſpiritual power of his, ſhould ſide with them (according to the obligation of the Safe-conduct) againſt him? But yet to give content, this *clauſe*, in the two following Safe-conducts (which ſee in Council of *Trent*, Seſſ. 15. under *Julius*, and again, Seſſ. 18. under *Pius*) was omitted. † *p.* 344.

§. 93. But after all this, 1ſt. The doctrine, ſaid to be common in the Church of *Rome*, that *fides non eſt ſervanda Hæreticis*; and 2ly the practiſe of the Council of *Conſtance*, according to it, in their putting to death *Jo. Huſſe*, are brought as arguments that there can be no ſecurity in *Safe-conducts*, how full ſoever, for men once accounted *Hereticks*. Of which Council of *Conſtance* it is urged as a *Conſtitution* (in *Soave*, p. 368. and elſewhere) —*That faith, or Safe-conduct, given by the Emperour, Kings or others, to Hereticks, or perſons ſuſpected, ought not to be obſerved*, and if the *Emperour's* not to be obſerved, we may alſo infer, not the *Council's*.

But

§ 94. But here first, The *doctrine* of those learned men in the Church of *Rome*, who have written of this subject, is much *wronged*, or *mistaken*. This question; *Whether faith given, be to be kept, to Hereticks*; as also, *Whether to Infidels, and Heathens, to Enemies, to Subjects in Rebellion*, (Princes at such time parting with their Rights) *&c.* being always stated by them *affirmatively*; and Faith, maintained to be kept as much to any of these, as to *Catholicks* themselves: And, if this be the *publick Faith*; of the *i. e. Prince*, or supreme temporal *Magistrate*, this Faith is declared to be *jure Gentium*, unviolable, as without which no peace, nor society, could be maintained in the world; and by no person whatever, not the Pope himself, to be dispensible, or relaxable.

[redacted]

[*Nullum scio Theologum*, (saith *Molanus* sometime Divinity-Professor at *Lovain* ‖) *neque etiam clari nominis Jurisconsultum, quin conformiter doceant, fidem publicam Hæretico servandam esse. Fateor quidem, esse aliquo numero Jurisconsultos, qui doceant, Fidem privatam hæretico servandam non esse, quia hostis est publicus.* [But this is upon supposing the *law* of a *Superiour*, prohibiting to private men the engagement of any such faith to such publick Enemies, being a thing *contra publicum bonum*, or, *contra salutem animarum*, declared by such Superiours. Else, the *publick faith* (suppose, of a *General Council*, *cedentis de suo jure*, and engaging exemption, and impunity, to some Heretick in a matter belonging to its Jurisdiction) or also *private Faith*, where is not such prohibition, once given to a publick Enemy, are affirmed to remain, afterward inviolable] P Layman Theol. Moral l. 2. tract. 3. c. 12. — *Fœdera publica Gentium jure introducta sunt — Idq; propter necessitatem — Quia, nisi fœdera publica, seu inter diversos principes, aut respublicas, seu inter Principem, & subditos ejus, v.g. rebellantes* [to whom he adds *Hereticks* upon the same ground, §. *Dico* 4°. — *Nec hac ita magnum* (saith he) *videri debet, speranti-bus in Deo & Christo summo Ecclesiæ defensore, qui auxilium fert in tempore opportuno*] *inita, omnium de servanda essent, nulla pax, aut societas, inter humanum Genus consistere posset.* And more particularly concerning *Hereticks* thus *Becanus* de fide Hæret. servand. c. 12. — *Quæstio est*; *an, quando Catholicus Princeps, sive sæcularis sit, sive Ecclesiasticus, concedit Hæreticis salvum conductum libere veniendi, & redeundi* (*sive id faciat jure communi, sive speciali* (i. e. this later way) *debeat illis servare fidem, necne? Affirmant* (saith he) *uno consensu omnes Catholici* [where he instanceth also in the practice of the Emperour, *Charles* the Fifth, to *Luther*; and goes on] *Hic valde miror adversarios, qui, etsi hæc audiant a nobis, tamen clamant; nos contrarium docere.* But see the same professed joyntly by

‖ *De fid. Hæret. servand. l. 3 c. 10*

by the Council of *Baſil*, and the *Emperour*, in their *Safe-conduct* to the *Bohemians*, ſecuring them not only from the hand of *violence*, but alſo, of *juſtice*; whoſe words, in the cloſe of it, are theſe.——*Promittimus ſine fraude, & quolibet dolo, quod nolumus, neque debemus, quacunque occaſione prætenſa, uti authoritate, vel potentia, jure, ſtatuto, vel privilegio legum, vel Canonum, & quorumq; Conciliorum ſpecialiter Conſtantienſis, & Senenſis, quacunq; forma verborum expreſſa, in aliquod præjudicium ſalvo Conductui per nos conceſſo.* [What more clear than this for the lawfulneſs, and undiſpenſableneſs, of ſuch publick faith, though given in the largeſt form, and moſt derogatory to the Engagers rights.]

§. 95. Only ſome *Caſes* there are, wherein (all judicious Proteſtants, I ſuppoſe, conſenting) *Faith* given may not be kept to *any* perſon whatſoever; and ſo neither to *Hereticks*; ſuch as theſe. 1ſt. If the *faith* be given not abſolutely, but *conditionally*, the Condition wanting, or failing, the faith, or promiſe, given with, and limited by, it, is voided. 2. So alſo, if the matter of the faith, oath, or promiſe, be a thing *unlawful* to be done; neither, here, may ſuch faith either lawfully be given; or, given, be obſerved. If the *matter be unlawful*, I ſay; either by the *divine* law, if, and though, it be the publick faith given by a *ſuprem* Authority: or alſo, by any *humane* law, if it be a faith given by *Inferiors*, and *Subjects* to ſuch laws. Among which unlawful things, and that *jure divino*, is to be numbred, if Faith be given, either by Prince or Subject, in any thing, which invades anothers right, or aſſumes to our ſelves, what only is in anothers lawful diſpoſal; and ſo involves doing wrong to a third perſon, which it is never lawful to do; (though *cedere de noſtro jure* is a thing very lawful) So, for Example, in the particular matter of *Hereticks*. If the *ſupreme* Temporal Magiſtrate ſhould paſs his *faith* to one ſuſpected of Hereſie, to free him from any *Trial* thereof by the *Eccleſiaſtical* Tribunal; or to free him, found guilty thereof, from the ſentence of Excommunication, a right belonging to the Church, and independent of ſecular Powers; or to introduce, or continue, him, excommunicated, in the Catholick Church-Aſſemblies, ſuch faith, as it is unlawfully given, ſo neither, given, can it lawfully be obſerved. Again, when the law of a Prince, or State, reſtrains to *profeſſed Hereticks* the publick Exerciſe of their Religion, or impoſeth ſome mulct upon them, and this law is here ſuppoſed juſt, if a *Subordinate* Officer, or *private* perſon, engage his faith to ſome Hereticks to the contrary, ſuch faith to them is not to be kept, as promiſing a thing not in his, but rather anothers, lawful power, and diſpoſal; And the ſame it were in a

privat mans faith given to conceal an *Heretick*, or a *Robber*, or the like, where the law of the State obligeth all perſons to detect them.

Mean while, where none of the forenamed caſes happen; where the matter of the pact is no *ſin* (and no ſin it is, that offends againſt no law) nor only *conditional*, Faith given to whomſoever, by what perſon ſoever, is affirmed no way diſpenſable, or remittible, (unleſs the party, to whom it is given, relax it) neither upon the plea of *Fear* in making it (I ſay, no ſuperior law voiding ſuch pacts) nor upon any *damage*, *temporal*, or *ſpiritual*, coming by it. For ſome ſpiritual damage to be ſuſtained thereby, affords no ſufficient ground to pretend an action unlawful. Since the *damage*, both ſpiritual, and temporal, to the world would be far the greater, when none, by reaſon of theſe, and the like *Exceptions*, could have any ſecurity of anothers faith: ſince ſuch Pacts, and Oaths, moſt what, are made, from ſome temporal neceſſity conſtraining men thereto, and frequently do infer ſome ſpiritual, or temporal damage; or do ſome otherwayes hinder ſome publick, or private good.

|| *l.* 3. *c.* 14. § 96.

[To this purpoſe; *Molanus* ſaith || concerning the *publick faith*, when given to another, where the matter of it is not unlawful; That it is undiſpenſable, or unrelaxable, by *any*, even the *Pope* himſelf; arguing thus, from the ill Conſequences thereof.—*Si Romanus Pontifex, ſemel, in fidei publicæ tranſgreſſione diſpenſaret, hæc non foret legitima diſpenſatio, ſed potius diſſipatio; quia deinceps nemo poſſet ſecurus eſſe, habito arege, aut alterius Tituli Principe, ſalvo Conductu, ſolenni juramento, eo quod ſemper periculum foret, ne Regia Poteſtas id, via diſpenſationis* [*à Pontifice*] *extorqueat, quod ſemel conceſſum eſſe novit.* Where he urgeth, *Heb.* 6 16.—[*Omnis Controverſia eorum finis, ad confirmationem eſt juramentum*] and *Soto*; who ſaith || —*Pontificem non poſſe relaxare juramentum cum prajudicio ejus, cujus intereſt.* And thus *Layman* on the ſame ſubject † —*Si a Chriſtiano, v. g. Rege cum* Infidelibus [and the ſame he repeateth afterward, *cum* Hæreticis; and before, *cum* Subditis Rebellantibus] *publicum fœdus fiat, nulla unquam ratione, ſeu directe, ſeu indirecte, Summus Pontifex relaxare poteſt. Ratio eſt; Quia cederet in maximum detrimentum, ac contemptum ipſiusmet etiam Eccleſiæ.—Quamobrem, ſi quando fœdus, a Catholico Rege cum Infidelibus legitimâ poteſtate conſtitutum, cedere poſſet videatur in Eccleſiæ Catholicæ detrimentum, a* ~~Concilio~~ *ſupremo ejus Rectore, & Defenſore, auxilium ſperandum*—*Neque vero* (ſaith he) *tergiverſationis locus eſt*; * *quod pars altera, ad fœdus ineundum, per vim injuſtam adacta ſit, cum paciſcentes ſuperiorem Judicem non habeant,*

|| *De Jure l.* 8. *q.* 1. *c.* 9.
† *l.* 2. *Tract.* 3. *c.* 12.

habeant, qui cauſa cognita, ipſis jus dicat. * Nor—*Quod fœdus, publica authoritate initum, Principi, aut Reipublicæ pacifcenti, perniciosum eſſe appareat.* Nor——**Quodcunque incommodum, ſeu detrimentum Eccleſiæ Catholicæ, ex fœderis obſervatione, inferendum*; and his reaſon is; becauſe if ſuch prejudices to Church, or State, be once admitted as juſt cauſes for voiding the publick Faith —*Nulla pax, aut Societas, inter humanum Genus conſiſtere poſſit.* This concerning the *publick Faith* given to Infidels, Hereticks, Rebels, or others, in matters, where no common Superior is acknowledged to have Right of diſpoſing them otherwiſe.]

§. 97. But as to *private Contracts, Faith*, or *Oaths*, where there is a common Superior to both parties, who may reſtrain, or moderate theſe upon all occaſions according to the publick and private good, here ſeveral Laws and Conſtitutions, and common Cuſtoms, grounded on a moral equity, and neceſſity, do give him a power, in ſeveral caſes which may happen [ſuch as theſe: where ſuch Contract, or Oath, is extorted by ſome injury firſt done to the party; as, by force, fraud, fear; or, where ſuch engagement made in ſome great perturbation, and tranſport of mind; or, where the contract, though in a matter lawful, yet brings ſome great, unexpected, and unforeſeen, damage, to the publick, or privat good, Spiritual, or Civil; or alſo, is a hinderance of ſome conſiderable greater good of the Church, or State, which the Contractors ought to preſer befor their private: when theſe are judged, not by the *party*, but by the Superior, to be ſuch] the laws, I ſay, do give Him power, in ſuch caſes, to relax ſuch *pacts*, or *Faith*: and to oblige the party, to whom they are made, being ſubject to him, and ſuch laws, to remit them: And the parties, in making any ſuch *pact*, may and ought to know this ſuperintendent power; or alſo, all ſuch Oaths and Contracts, when they are made, are ſuppoſed to include a tacit Exception of ſuch *caſes*, to be ſtated by the Arbitrement of ſuch *Superiors*. And indeed: what thing better can be contrived, within the limits of a ſettled Government, than, that ſuch engagements ſhould be tranſacted with ſuch a reſerve of capability of relaxation by the Superior, where, otherwiſe, either by the difficulty of the obſervance of them, the circumſtances being changed, they will probably be broken: or ſome great damage by them, publick, or private, inferred. But, in the publick, or private, Faith, paſſed between perſons that are joyned together in nó ſuch *ſociety*, no ſuch thing can be admitted; but the matter of ſuch oath, or promiſe being *jure Divino* lawful, and diminiſhing no third Perſons legal Rights, all damages whatever are to be ſuſtained in a ſtrict, and undiſpenſable obſervance thereof, ſo far

as the party to whom ſuch engagement is made, ſhall exact it: And ſo, in ſome ſence, Faith is maintained, to be kept by Catholicks to Enemies, Hereticks, Infidels, *&c.* when not ſo, by one Catholick to another; becauſe the conſtitutions, or cuſtoms, of the Government Eccleſiaſtiacal, or Civil, under which Catholicks live, do not extend to theſe other Covenants; and the excuſe of *damage*, *fear*, *force*, &c. hath here no place, or conſideration, where is to be had no common umpire, and Judge of ſuch matters.

§. 98. If it be ſaid here; That *Secular* Princes are made by Roman Divines, *inferiour* and ſubordinate to the *Eccleſiaſtical* ſuprem (the Pope, or General Council) and ſo, that the Sanctions, and laws of the Church, by what is ſaid before, § 97. will void at pleaſure the *Oath and engagement of Princes* to what ever Confederat, in whatever matter, as this being *contrary* to the law of a Superior, whoſe Conſtitutions they are obliged to obſerve. It is anſwered, that the Roman Church owns no ſuch Doctrine; nor do the Eccleſiaſtical Governours claim any Supremacy, or Legiſlative power, ſave in Spiritual matters. Contrary to which, therefore, if any of the Churches Subjects, though a Prince, make any oath, or promiſe, ſuch Faith given is not to be kept, by vertue of the former ſubjection of ſuch perſon to the *Churches Laws*. But, as for any Oaths, or engagements of Princes in other matters *Secular*; or alſo, any uſe of the Secular Sword, whether in matters Temporal or Spiritual, the Church claims no Superiority herein. The Secular and Eccleſiaſtical Magiſtrate have their diſtinct and independent Rights and Juriſdictions, freely confeſſed, by Cardinal *Bellarmine*, to be, both held from *Chriſt*, and nor from one another—*Ex Scripturis* (ſaith he † *nihil habemus, niſi datas Pontifici claves regni cælorum: de clavibus Regni Terrarum nulla mentio fit, Traditio Apoſtolica nulla.—Quando Rex ſit Chriſtianus, non perdit Regnum Terrarum, quod jam obtinebat.*— And, quoting a paſſage out of an Epiſtle of Pope *Nicolaus*.— *Quicquid* (ſaith he) *Imperatores habent, dicit Nicolaus, a Chriſto eos habere. Peto igitur; vel poteſt ſummus Pontifex auferre a Regibus, & Imperatoribus hoc, tanquam ſummus ipſe Rex, & Imperator; aut non poteſt; ſi poteſt, ergo eſt major Chriſto; Si non poteſt, ergo non habet vere poteſtatem Regiam.* Neither is any ſuch *Power in Temporals* abſolutely neceſſary to the Church, in order to Spirituals, without the exerciſe of which power the Primitive Church, though moſt grievouſly oppreſſed by *Secular* States, yet enjoyed this Government in *Spirituals*, perfect and entire, as to all things eſſentially neceſſary thereto. Their proper and diſtinct Rights, then, both theſe ſupremes have. And

† *De Rom. Pontif. l. 5. c. 3.*

their

their oaths and engagement (paſſed in matters of their proper *right*) to what perſons ſoever are denied generally, by Catholick Divines, to be *diſſolvable* by one another.

§. 99. [Of this particular of keeping faith with *Hereticks*, in ſuch matters, thus, *P. Layman* a learned Jeſuite. †—*Dico 4to —Si Catholici cum Hæreticis publicum fœdus ineant, non poteſt per authoritatem Pontificiam ſolvi, aut relaxari*; where he quotes alſo *Molanus*, ſaying, †—*Neque ullum hactenus extitit, aut unquam extabit hujus rei exemplum.* And thus *Becanus. de fid. Hæret. ſervand. c. 7.*—*Virtutes illæ, ex quibus oritur obligatio ſervandæ fidei in promiſſis, aque nos obligant, ſive apud Catholicos, ſive apud Hæreticos, verſemur: Nuſquam enim* licet *mentiri; nuſquam jus alterius violare, nuſquam injuſtitiam committere nunquam perjurum eſſe.—Quando fidelis paciſcuntur cum Gentilibus, & Idolatris, debent illi ſervare fidem in rebus licitis & honeſtis; ergo etiam, quando paciſcuntur cum Hæreticis.* An oath of *fidelity*, therefore, taken by a Subject to an *Heretical* Prince, to aid him againſt all invaders of, his Dominions; or other temporal Rights, to pay him ſuch, and ſuch taxes, for the preſerving of *Juſtice*, and protecting of his Subjects from *violence*, and injuries, is, to be obſerved, and undiſpenſable, without the Princes conſent, becauſe the matter of it lawful: But an oath taken to ſerve him in fight, or to perform any other act, for the *ruine* of the *Chriſtian*, or the *Catholick*, Religion, is not to be kept, becauſe the matter of ſuch oath is *contra jus Divinum*.]

† Theol. Moral. l. 2. Tract. 3. c. 12.

† *De fid. Hæret. ſervand. l. 5. c. 14.*

§. 100. As for that arguing of a late Proteſtant writer †—That it follows from this propoſition maintained by Catholicks; [*viz.* That faith given to Hereticks, *contra jus Divinum*, is not to be kept]: that therefore faith given to *Hereticks* is in no caſe to be kept; becauſe all *Hereſie* is *contra jus Divinum*: his words are.—*Simanca concludes, that faith given, againſt the Divine law, is not to be kept, and it is well known, that all Hereſies are accounted ſo by you; and therefore in no caſe faith is to be kept with Hereticks.*]

† Stillingfl. Rational Account. pt. 2. c. 3. p. 352, & 350.

1ſt. If he argue well; Proteſtants are to maintain his Concluſion, as well as Catholicks; for Proteſtants alſo grant the two premiſſes. 2ly. The arguing is like this: that faith in no caſe is to be kept to a drunkard: becauſe drunkenneſs is held, *contra jus Divinum*; and it is unſyllogiſtical, and very faulty: Becauſe, though Hereſie, or Drunkenneſs, be a thing *contra jus Divinum*, yet that thing, wherein faith is given to ſuch Heretick, or Drunkard, may not be ſo. But if faith were given to an Heretick, concerning his Hereſie: As, to maintain it with him; to aid or aſſiſt, him in it; ſuch faith indeed were not to be kept, for the reaſon given; becauſe *Hereſie*, and all defence of it, are, *contra jus Divinum*;

divinum? But further: suppose the faith given to a Heretick be for the *toleration* of his *Heresie*; neither do Catholicks hold this (due circumstances put) to be *contra jus Divinum*. For even a *moral Evil* may be lawfully tolerated, when there is just fear of far more evil, and that moral too, by not tolerating it. For supposing, the toleration of any false religion by a Catholick Prince, without inflicting due punishment upon the Professors thereof within his Dominions is not lawful, *jure divino*, yet is it so, only to those, in whose *absolute*, and *free* power it is, to prohibit such Religion; And then; whether this, *rebus sic stantibus*, be for such time, and place, in a Princes *free* power, must be left wholy to his arbitrement, who doubtless is the suprem Judge of his own Secular strength. And whom soever he cannot master as to force, however legally his Subject, neither may he reckon him under his Government, as to coaction to his duty; in such a case then toleration of Heresie is not *contra jus Divinum*. And, there is the same ground of keeping faith with such, as there is, with a forraine Enemy; for the Common weales-sake. Becan. Ib. c. 10.—*Si Princeps Catholicus paciscatur cum Hæreticis de tolerandâ libertate religionis, quam sine majori detrimento impedire non potest, sine dubio fides servanda est.*

§. 101. This said in General of the Doctrine of the Roman-Divines in this point, which was the first thing objected before, §. 93. Now to consider the 2d. the *decree*, and *fact*, in the *Council* of *Constance*.

For its *Constitution*, Sess. 19. It is only this.—*Præsens Sancta Synodus declarat, nullum fidei Catholicæ, vel jurisdictionis Ecclesiasticæ, præjudicium generari, vel impedimentum præstari posse, vel debere, ex quovis salvo conductu per Imperatorem &c. Hæreticis, vel de Hæresi diffamatis, concesso, quocunq; vinculo se adstrinxerit, quo minus, dicto salvo conductu non obstante, liceat Judici competenti, & Ecclesiastico de hujusmodi personarum erroribus inquirere, & alias contra eos debite procedere, eosdemq; punire, quantum justitia suadebit,* &c. [*i. e.* so far as their jurisdiction extends.] *Nec sic promittentem* [i. e. Imperatorem, *&c.*] *cum fecerit, quod in ipso est* [*i. e.* quod jure facere potest] *ex hoc* [salvo conductu] *in aliquo remansisse obligatum* [as to any further observance of his promises.] Which Constitution, in all the parts of it, must needs be justified, unless one mans *promise*, or *oath*, takes away another mans *Right*. But such a promise, as takes away another mans right, is unlawful, and therefore void; and he who thus engageth, very faulty in making it, but obliged to break it.

Again,

Again, for matter of *fact*; that the Council contained it ſelf within the limits of the Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, leaving, after this executed, *Jo. Huſſe*, as to any further temporal puniſhment, to the juſtice of the imperial laws, appears ſufficiently in the concluſion of its *Sentence* againſt him, *Seſſ.* 15. ending thus.—*Hæc Sancta Synodus Joannem Huſs, attento, quod Eccleſia Dei non habeat ultra quid gerere valeat, judicio ſæculari relinquere, & ipſum Curiæ ſæculari relinquendum fore, decernit.* Thus much clear.

§. 102. But next, It is not ſo eaſie to reſolve punctually what was the form of the Emperours *Safe-conduct*, granted to *Huſſe*; whether it run after the common manner, for ſecuring his coming and returning from any unjuſt violence, that might be offered; or yet further; for ſecuring him alſo from any execution of Secular Juſtice upon him, if found criminal, [for this later alſo, as to thoſe puniſhments belonging to the Juriſdiction of the civil Magiſtrate, is granted to be in his lawful power, and he obliged to keep his faith, made either of theſe ways] I ſay, this is not ſo eaſie to reſolve; nor what jealouſie the Emperour might have at firſt, before he was better ſatisfied concerning their diſtinct Juriſdictions, leaſt the Councils proceedings upon the trial of *Huſs* for Hereſie might ſome way infringe his Safe-conduct. Now for any evidence in theſe things: 1ſt. The *Safe conduct* it ſelf is no where extant. 2ly. *Molanus*, with many other Catholick Writers, with great probability, contend; that this *Safe conduct* was drawn only in the common form of ſuch writs, and to be underſtood in their ordinary ſenſe; namely, to ſecure ſuch perſon from any violence, that ſhall be offered towards him, but not from juſtice, for which the aforenamed Author || quotes *Mynſinger*, *Obſ.* 82.—*Quando datur alicui ſecuritas, vel ſalvus conductus* [*i. e.* in the common form] *tunc intelligitur ſolum de violentia, quæ de facto contra jus infertur*; and produceth an uſual form of the Emperours.—*Damus tibi fidem publicam, cauſam dicendi in Judicio contra vim, non tamen contra juris Executionem.* And this is rendred much the more creditable, in that we find a *Safe-conduct* in this very ſenſe granted by this Council of *Conſtance*. *Seſſ.* 6. to *Hierom* of *Prague* (for *Huſs* deſired none from the Council) upon which he alſo thought fit to venture himſelf, and appear before it. The form thereof is this. —*Citamus*, &c. *quatenus compareas*, &c. *recepturus in omnibus juſtitiæ complementum, ad quod a violentia (juſtitiâ ſemper ſalvâ) omnem ſalvum-conductum noſtrum, quantum in nobis eſt, & fides exigit orthodoxa, preſentium tenore offerimus.* Now, ſince *Hierom*, after *Huſs* his having been ſome time at *Conſtance*, ventured to appear there upon ſuch a Safe-conduct, why may we not reaſonably imagine || *f.* 2. *c.* 3.

gine (notwithſtanding the declarations of ſome Proteſtants of the extream folly of ſuch an action) that *Jo. Huſs* might have the ſame confidence, or commit the like over-ſights, as the other; as, much miſtaking at firſt both the ſtrict juſtice of the Council, and the weakneſs of his cauſe. The ſame thing may be probably gathered from his flight, after ſome time, out of *Conſtance*, hidden in a Cart laden with goods; which argues the little confidence he had in the *Form* of his *Safe-conduct* to protect him from juſtice; as this alſo doth; that neither at his *trial*, nor his *Death*, he is mentioned, in his followers relating his ſtory, either to have claimed the the priviledge of ſuch a Safe-conduct, or accuſed any of the breach thereof.

But now, ſuppoſe it a Safe-conduct, ſecuring him not only from *violence*, but alſo from *execution* of *juſtice*; yet is it related to have been ſo conditioned, as that, if he ſhould attempt any flight (which he did) he ſhould forfeit all the benefit of it; and, thus free, Juſtice Eccleſiaſtical, and Civil, proceed againſt him. Now, that, by one of theſe waies, the Emperour was diſcharged from his faith given to him, may juſtly be preſumed, in that, after his condemnation for Hereſie, he made no ſcruple to put him to death; and that, before any Conciliar decree was paſſed by the Council in this matter, as it were to relax, or diſſolve his former engagement; *Huſs* his Execution being in *July*; and the aforementioned decree paſſed in *September* following.

§. 103. But be theſe things how they will, of which ſeveral flouriſhes, and conjectures are made both wayes; And let us ſuppoſe, *the Safe-conduct* to free him totally from the Secular Juſtice; and ſome miſcarriages alſo to have been in the proceedings of the *Emperour* or *Council* (which is not impoſſible:) yet, not the leaſt errour can be found in the *Decree* or *Conſtitution* or Doctrine of the Council, which is ſo much blamed, as which expreſly declares; That the Prince, once his faith given, *debet facere, quod in ipſo eſt* [i. e *quod eſt in ipſius legitimâ poteſtate*] and then: This alſo is granted (See *Becan. c.* 12. quoted before, §. 94.) That it is a thing in the Princes lawful power, to ſuſpend the execution of his own laws; and upon ſuch ſuppoſitions, if the Emperour through the importunities of ſome others did not this, I ſee not how he can be therein excuſed: But ſtill the Councils Decree hath no hand in ſuch guilt. But laſtly, The Delegats from *Bohemia*, who where Huſſites, their repairing, ſome ſixteen years after, to the Council of *Baſil*, upon the ſecurity of the *Council*, and the ſame *Emperor Sigiſmund's Safe-conduct*, ſhews ſufficiently that the *Safe conducts* of *Huſs*, and *Hierom* of *Prague*, were too narrow to ſhield

ſhield them from *juſtice*, as well as from *injury*; and not ſuch faith of the Emperour, or Council, as was promiſed to them, to have been afterward *broken*: For to the ſame *Faith*, only the form of of the Safe-conduct changed, theſe Commiſſioners from *Bohemia* freely truſted themſelves. Thus much of the Council of *Conſtance*, in which, for that which is related here out of the Story, I muſt refer you to,--*Molanus de Fide Hæret. ſervand. l.* 3.---*Spondanus*, and the Authors mentioned by him, in A. D. 1415. n. 44, and 45. eſpecially *Cocleus*, in his *Hiſtor. Huſsit. l.* 2. and 3. who takes his matter out of the Stories delivered by ſome of *Huſs* his followers.

§. 104. But yet (to give all content) the *Council* of *Trent*, in their *Safe-conduct*, did expreſly, *huic conſtitutioni Conſtantienſi, in hac parte, pro hac vice, derogare.*

The *Trent Conduct* thus qualified for their ſatisfaction; yet another exception the Proteſtants had againſt it; That whereas they chiefly deſired two things [*viz.* 1. That the *Scripture alone* might be the *judge* or rule to try the *Controverſies* by; and, 2. That the *Proteſtants* joyned in an *equal* number with the *Catholicks*, might have deciſive votes; or, the Controverſies be decided by an equal number of Lay-Judges, choſen on both ſides] The form of this *Trent-ſafe conduct*, for the *Proteſtants*, did not as to theſe *exactly* follow that of *Baſil*, for the *Bohemians*; whereby (had it been granted) ſaith *Soave* †) *the Proteſtants would have obtained one great point; that is, that the Controverſies ſhould be decided by the Holy Scripture*; and afterward (*Soave*, p. 366.) It is pretended, *That ſuch a* Safe-conduct *would have given them a deciſive voice.* But in anſwer to theſe: For this laſt point, there appears no ſuch thing in that conduct of *Baſil*: For the former point; the words of the *Safe-conduct* in *Concil. Baſil.* 4. *Seſſ.* are theſe.—*In cauſa quatuor Articulorum per eos attentorum lex divina, praxis Chriſti Apoſtolica, & Eccleſia primitiva, una cum Conciliis, Doctoribus, fundantibus ſe veraciter in eadem, pro veriſsimo, & indifferenti judice, in hoc Baſilienſi Concilio admittentur.* Whereas the words of the Safe-conduct in the Council of *Trent* are theſe—*S. Trident. Synodus concedit, quod cauſæ controverſæ, ſecundum ſacram Scripturam, & Apoſtolorum traditiones, probata Concilia, Catholicæ Eccleſiæ conſenſum, & Sanctorum Patrum authoritates, in pradicto Concilio Tridentino, tractentur*, where we ſee both the Conducts do agree in [*praxis*, or *Traditio Apoſtolorum*] in [*Concilia*, and *Doctores*, or *Patres*] only the later omits the clauſe [*fundantes ſe veraciter in Scriptura.*] The reaſon of which omiſſion, ſee in *Pallav. l.* 12. *c.* 15 *n.* 9. And it is clear at firſt ſight, becauſe this clauſe was capable (though.

† p. 344.

contrary to the intention of the Council of *Baſil*) of ſuch a falſe Gloſſe (namely, if it be thus underſtood; that when any Authority was produced out of *Councils* or *Fathers*, the Proteſtants might accept, or reject it, as they judged it to be founded, or not founded in the Scriptures) as would void the ſenſe of the words, that went before it, and make them needleſly added to [*lex divina*.] the Proteſtants, when any ſuch authority out of Councils or Fathers is urged, anſwering; *Oſtende, quod illa Concilia, &c. ſe veraciter fundarunt in Scriptura*: which is the ſame with; *Proba hoc quod Concilium dicit ex Scripturis*. For, ſuppoſe thoſe Councils quote ſome Scriptures for what they ſay, yet will not Proteſtants therefore yield, that what they ſhall ſay is founded there; becauſe they may ſay, they quote them in a wrong ſenſe: and now you may ſee the reaſon of what *Soave* ſaid above, and the great point the Proteſtants had gained, if the Safe-conduct had run in the Form of *Baſil*, though that Form names, with the Scriptures, *Concilia, & Doctores, & praxin Apoſtolicam, & primitivæ Eccleſiæ*, for the judge of Controverſies. But why is the Tridentine Council ſo averſe, you will ſay, that *Scripture only* ſhould be the Judge, or the ground of their judgment in matters of Religion? For this reaſon; becauſe, when there is controverſie of the *meaning* of Scripture (as moſtly it is) it is fit, the Councils and Fathers ſhould terminate the diſpute therein; or elſe what end can be of ſuch Controverſie, when thoſe, againſt whom the Councils declare, ſhall ſo often ſay, the Councils declare againſt the Scriptures, *i. e.* their ſenſe of them? But here it is ſufficient; that though the Safe-conduct, as to the way, which the Proteſtants demanded, of the trial of their Doctrines, was excepted againſt (of which more by and by) yet, as to the ſecurity of their perſons, it was unqueſtioned. Thus much from §. 82. that no deficieney in the *Summons, place*, or *Safe-conduct*, hath rendred this Council illegal, or non-obliging.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

8. *That this Council is not rendred illegal, by the Oath of Biſhops taken to the Pope,* §. 105.

9. *Nor yet, by the Biſhops, or Popes, being a Party, and Judges in their own Cauſe,* §. 118.

1. *Not, by the Biſhops their being Judges,* Ib.

Where,

Of ſeveral other waies of judging Eccleſiaſtical Controverſies, juſtly rejected, §. 118.

2. *Nor, by the Popes being Judge,* §. 122.

§. 105. 8.

8ly. NEither doth the *Oath*, that was taken by the Biſhops to the Pope, hinder this Council, conſiſting of thoſe Biſhops, from being a *free*, *legal*, and *obliging* Council. The ſum of which *Oath* is,—*Ego N. Epiſcopus fidelis ero Sancto Petro, Sanctæ Apoſtolicæ Romanæ Eccleſiæ, Domino meo Papæ N. ejuſq; Succeſſoribus Canonice intrantibus*—*Papatum Romanæ Eccleſiæ, & Regulas Sanctorum Patrum, adjutor ero ad defendendum, & retinendum contra omnem Hominem* [Regulas Sanctorum Patrum; or *Regalia Sancti Petri*, as it is in later Pontificals; which *Regalia*, I ſuppoſe relates to the Popes temporal Dominions, and is more properly fitted to the Biſhops living in, or near them; as alſo *non ero in Conſilio, ut vitam perdat*, and ſeveral other Paſſages in the Oath, ſeem to be] —*Jura, honores, privilegia, & authoritatem Romanæ Eccleſiæ, Domini noſtri Papæ, & ſucceſſorum prædictorum, conſervare, defendere, augere, & promovere curabo. Nec ero in Conſilio, in facto, ſeu tractatu, in quibus contra Dominum noſtrum, vel Romanam Eccleſiam, aliqua ſiniſtra, ſive præjudicialia perſonarum, juris, honoris, ſtatus, & poteſtatis eorum, machinentur.* § 106.

1. Where note firſt. That it is the ordinary, and cuſtomary Oath taken by all Biſhops at their *Conſecration*, not an oath impoſed on them with any particular Relation to this Council; and that it is, for ſubſtance, the ſame oath, as hath been uſually ſworn in former ages, precedent to many other Councils, without being complained of, or conceived any way to abridge their *Liberties*: Nor is it now a grievance, ſave to ſuch, as deny to this Prime-Patriarch his *ancient* and *Canonical* rights.

§. 107. 2. 2ly. That some such stipulation of *obedience* and *fidelity* to Ecclesiastical Superiours, is required by the *Reformed* themselves: and every Bishop in the Church of *England*, at his Consecration, takes an oath to perform all due reverence and obedience to his Archbishop, and the Metropolitan Church, and their Successors. And, though, in a thing, so far as it is granted lawful, it matters not, how new is the practice; yet such an oath particularly to this Prime Patriarch, especially for the Bishops subjected to his *Patriarchy*, hath been also anciently used [See the order in *Concil. Tolet. 11. can. 10.* — *Omnes Pontifices, Rectoresq; Ecclesiarum, tempore, quo ordinandi sunt, sub cautione promittant, ut fidem Catholicam custodiant* — *atq; obsequii reverentiam præeminenti sibi dependant:* [where why, *omnes Pontifices, præeminenti sibi*, may not as lawfully be extended to the pre-eminency of the *Patriarch*, as of the *Metropolitan*, I see nothing to hinder.] And see *apud Baron* A.D. 722. the form of the oath of *fidelity* to the *Pope* taken by *Winfrid* our Countrey-man, and other Bishops of those times, at their Ordination — *Promitto Ego N. Episcopus tibi, B. Petre Apostolorum Princeps, vicarioq; tuo B. Gregorio Papæ, & successori ejus — me omnem fidem & puritatem Sanctæ fidei Catholicæ exhibere, & in unitate ejusdem fidei perstere.* Again, — *Fidem, & puritatem meam atq; concursum tibi, & utilitatibus Ecclesiæ tuæ,* [i.e. Petri] *(cui à Domino Deo potestas ligandi, solvendiq; data est) & prædicto vicario tuo, atq; Successoribus ejus per omnia exhibere,* &c. And see much what the like form in *Greg. Epist. l.* 10. *ep.* 31. — *Ego Civitatis illius Episcopus, sub anathematis Obligatione, promitto sancto Petro Apostolorum Principi, atq; ejus vicario Beato Gregorio, vel successoribus ipsius — semper me in unitate sanctæ Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, & Communione Romani Pontificis, per omnia, permansurum. Unde jurans dico per Deum Omnipotentem, & hæc Sancta 4or. Evangelia,* &c.] where, though the occasion of the Oath is a returning from Heresie as one confines it, || yet the word, *promitto sancti Petri Apostolorum Principis vicario, me in Communione Romani Pontificis, per omnia, permansurum* (in this; as also, *me fidem atque concursum tibi & utilitatibus Ecclesiæ tuæ per omnia exhibiturum,* in the precedent Form) include a fidelity, and subjection to St. *Peter's* Chair; and that the Bishops, in those ancient dayes, sware no less, to continue in the Communion of the Bishop of *Rome*, than in the unity of the Catholick Church; Indeed these two were then conceived inseparable; and therefore, in the same Form, it is called, *unitas sedis Apostolicæ*; and those, who desert it, are said to depart *à radice unitatis*. Now, this Oath being taken lawfully in such a case; why may it not be so, at another time? And if this *Council* of

|| See *Stillingfl. p.* 490.

Trent,

Trent, by reaſon of ſuch modern Oath taken by the Biſhops to the Pope, may not be thought *Free* to proceed againſt any diſorders in this See; neither may any of thoſe Councils which have been celebrated ſince the uſe of the like Oaths, ſince that *Toletan Council*, ſince *Gregories*, or *Winfrids*, times, be thought ſo

3ly. Such Oath only obligeth to *Canonical* Obedience; only, to yield ſuch obedience to the Biſhop of *Rome*, as the *Canons* of former Councils do require,—*Donec Pontifex eſt; & dum jubet ea, quæ ſecundum Deum; & ſacros Canones jubere poteſt; ſed non jurant, ſe non dicturos, quod ſentiunt, in Concilio; vel ſe non depoſituros eum, ſi hæreticum eſſe convincant*, as *Bellarmin* † anſwered long ſince to this ſcruple: only they ſwear to defend, and promote, all, not to be in any action, or plot againſt, any of, his *legal*, and *Canonical* (for this is alwaies underſtood in oaths) Rights, Authority, Priviledges, *&c.* Now what offence here, what reſtraint of any lawful liberty? For an Oath taken in general to *all* the Canonical rights of the Pope, and not ſpecifying any in *particular*, leaves the Biſhops, and the Council, in perfect liberty to diſpute, examine, and determine what are his Canonical, and rightful priviledges, what not; leaves them liberty, to queſtion his Supremacy, ſo far as he ſeems to them to claim any ſuch *in* cauſes, or over perſons, Eccleſiaſtical, not appearing by divine right, or Church-Conſtitution, due unto him: and generally, in liberty, to queſtion, as *Bellarmin* obſerves, his commanding, or practiſing, things they think unlawful. And indeed the *Biſhops* in *Trent*, ſworn to maintain all his *lawful*, yet did diſpute ſome of his *pretended*, Rights, and Priviledges; and after much debate, left them unſtated. Nor did the Pope, or his Legats, though willing enough to have prevented ſuch agitations, yet plead any obligation in the Epiſcopal *Oath*, againſt them. This Oath therefore, obliging only to the obſervation of the former Divine, and Church-Laws, concerning the Papal Dignities, can be no more prejudicial to the liberty of Councils, than the former Laws and Canons are prejudicial thereto. §. 108. 3.

† *De Concil. l.* 1. *c.* 21.

4ly. Biſhops, *not ſworn*, yet ſtill remain obliged to the obſervance of all ſuch Canons; ſo that ſuch Oath is not the addition of a *new*, but the confirmation of a *former* obligation, which, when our Superiors, for their greater ſecurity, call for, we cannot juſtly deny. §. 109. 4.

5ly. Yet neither do ſuch obligation, nor ſuch Oath, laid on Biſhops taken ſingly, reſtrain their liberty, when met in a Council; but that they, with the preſent Popes conſent, may then *alter*, and *change* thoſe *Canons*; and ſo, their obligation to them: §. 110. 5.

No

No more than a Princes, or his Subjects ſwearing to the obſervance of the civil laws of a Nation, hinders theſe, when met in *Parliament*, to abrogate any law, or enact the contrary; all oaths to laws have this tacit limitation: *viz.* till thoſe, who have the authority, ſhall think fit to repeal them, And, in the conſecration of the Reformed Biſhops in *England*, the Oath, impoſed upon them, of obedience to the Archbiſhop, is conceived to be unprejudicial to the *liberty* of their *Synods*.

§. 111. 6. 6ly. If in this Oath any thing was ſworn that was unlawful, the Biſhops, ſo ſoon as this unlawfulneſs appeared to them, from that moment, without any *diſpenſation*, were diſcharged from the obſervance thereof; as *Luther*, and *Bucer*, ſo ſoon as it ſeemed to them unlawful, thought themſelves quitted from the ſame, or the like, *Oath*, formerly taken, when they firſt entred into a religious Order; but if nothing was ſworn in it but what was lawful, why complain the *Reformed* of this *Oath*?

§. 112. 7. 7ly. Did this Oath of the Biſhops lay ſome reſtraint upon their liberty, it would be only in one point of the Proteſtant Controverſies, that concerning the Popes *Supremacy*, but would leave it *free* as to all, or moſt of the reſt. Neither ſee I what influence their ſwearing to maintain the *Popes* juſt *Priviledges* could have upon their votes, in the points of *Juſtification*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Invocation of Saints*, and the like. For if this be named one of his *privileges*, that their decrees in theſe points are invalid, unleſs by him confirmed, yet there is no reaſon, that this ſhould incline them at all to vote, in theſe, contrary to their own judgment. 1ſt. Becauſe (omitting here the obligation they have to promote *Truth* upon whatever reſiſtance) they have no cauſe to preſume *his* Judgment in ſuch points (eſpecially after their Conſultations) would be different from *theirs*. Or, 2ly. Becauſe, if they knew it would differ, yet they underſtood alſo, that without the *Concurrence* of their *Judgments*, his likewiſe is rendred invalid, and not able to eſtabliſh any thing, wherein they diſſent: As in ſome affairs of this *Council* it ſo happened. This, for the *Oath*; to paſs on to others.

§. 113. 9. 9ly. Whereas it is pretended; that the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, who preſided, and thoſe *Biſhops*, who ſat in the Council, were a party and Judges in their own cauſe: As, for inſtance, the controverſies that were to be decided being between theſe two parties, *Proteſtants* and *Roman Catholicks*, that thoſe of the Council were all Roman Catholicks, and the Proteſtants not permitted to have with the reſt any deciſive vote: Again; the Proteſtants accuſing the Roman, and other Weſtern, Churches, of many *corruptions* both in

in their *doctrine*, and in their *diſcipline*, yet that this Council was made up of the Biſhops of thoſe Churches which were thus accuſed: Again; one controverſie being againſt the ſuperiority of the *Order* of *Biſhops* to the *Presbytery*, that therefore in this the Biſhops were clearly a party: Another controverſie being againſt the *Popes Supremacy*, and particularly againſt his authority of *calling* and preſiding in Councils, that therefore in this the Pope was a party: Beſides, that his ſtiling the Proteſtants *hereticks* before the Council renders him in it no impartial, nor unprejudiced Judge in their cauſe: I ſay, neither do theſe pretences hinder this Council (ſuppoſing it compoſed of ſo many *Biſhops* of the *Catholick Church*, as are neceſſary to the conſtitution of a *General* Council, or of ſo many *Biſhops* of the *Weſtern* Churches, as are neceſſary to the conſtitution of a *Patriarchal*) from being a lawful Judge in theſe controverſies; and the acts therof, obligatory to all; nor hinder not the Pope from preſiding there.

Where, 1ſt. To conſider the legality of the Synod, as it conſiſts of ſuch Biſhops. 1.

And, 1ſt. Here we find; that all *Hereſies* and *Schiſmes* have had the ſame plea againſt the former Councils, as the Reformed againſt this of *Trent*: namely, that the *contrary* party, the accuſer, or the accuſed, was their *Judge*. All the Chriſtian Clergy was once divided into *Arrians* and *Anti-Arrians*, or *Neſtorians*, and *Anti-Neſtorians*; as, in the times of the Council of *Trent*, it was into the *Proteſtants* and *Roman*-Catholicks: and the Arrians then accuſed the Catholick Biſhops of their corruption of the *doctrine* of the *Trinity*, as the Proteſtants did now the Roman Catholicks of ſeveral corruptions in doctrine, and diſcipline: Yet ſo it was, that the Arrians were condemned by the Anti-Arrian Biſhops, as being the *major* part; neither were they allowed any other *Judge*, ſave theſe; and this, a Judgment approved by the Proteſtants. *Neſtorius*, Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, on the one ſide, and *Celeſtine* Biſhop of *Rome*, and *Cyril* of *Alexandria* on the other ſide, counter-accuſe one another of *Hereſie*; yet was *Neſtorius* ſentenced, and condemned, in the 3*d*. G. Council, by *Celeſtine* preſiding there by *Cyril*, his Subſtitute. §. 114. 1.

Dioſcorus Biſhop of *Alexandria* and the *Eutychian* party had great conteſt with the reſt of Chriſtian Biſhops, *Anti-Eutychians*; proceeding ſo far, that *Dioſcorus* with his party preſumed to excommunicate *Leo*; yet was he and his party judged, and condemned by the *Anti-Eutychian* party, being a *major* part in the 4th. G. Council; the ſame *Leo* preſiding there by his Legats, and *Dioſcorus*, though the 2d. Patriarch, being not permitted to ſit, or vote

vote in the Council. And these Judgments approved by the Protestants. *Arius*, an Alexandrian Presbyter, and *Alexander* the Bishop, there had much controversie between them, and accused one another, before the Council of *Nice*; yet *Alexander*, in that Council, sate as *Arius* his Judge amongst the rest, and gave his definitive vote against him. And doubtless, had *Arius* been a Bishop, and the major part of that Council Arian, *Arius* should have judged *Alexander* in the same manner. Allowed examples in this kind might be alledged, infinite.

§. 125. n. 1. 2. 2ly. Now to shew, that such judgments are lawful and obligatory, notwithstanding that the Judges are a Party, formerly accusing and accused by, the other, of corruptions, errours, usurpations, *&c.* I beg these three things to be granted me, having elsewhere sufficiently secured them. 1 That the Church is delegated, by Christ, as the supream Judge on earth for all *Theological*, and *Spiritual* matters, secure for ever not to erre in necessaries, and that as a Guide. 2ly. That the *judgment* of the *Bishops*, and chief Pastors of the Church, as being, at least by Ecclesiastical Constitution, and common practice of former Councils (as appears by the subscriptions to them) established the *Representative* thereof, is to be taken for that of the *Church*; or else, the judgement of all former Councils, even of the four first, may be questioned. 3ly. That the vote of the *major* part, where *all* consent not in the same judgment, must conclude the *whole*; both, for those Bishops sitting in the Council, and those Bishops absent, that accept it.

§. 115. n. 2. Which *Judge*, that hath been, of all former ages, by whom Christians have been settled in truth against all former Heresies, *Arianism*, *Nestorianism*, *Pelagianism*, *&c.* if any, because he finds it not to suit with the late *Reformation*, will now reject; let him tell us what other Judge he can put in their place? For if this ancient and former Judge must be supposed (contrary to our *Lords Promise*) deficient in necessaries, and incident into Heresie, Blasphemy, Idolatry; and then, if a *few* of these ecclesiastical Governours (surmising this) against *many*, a few *Inferiors* against many their *Superiors*, only after they have first made their complaints to them, and propounded their reasons, and been rejected, may then apply themselves to procure the assistance, and power, of the temporal Magistrate (one, who may be seduced also, and assist in a wrong cause;) and so may, first, sit down in the *Chair*, and *judge* of the wilfulness, and obstinacy, of these others in defence of their supposed errors and crimes: and then, may proceed to a reforming of the Church, or some part thereof, against them; (things which

which a late opposer of this Council † is necessitated to maintain) will not thus, the revolution of *judging* and governing in ecclesiastical affairs, proceed *in infinitum*; and necessarily bring in a confusion of *Religion's*, (as some Countreys have had late experience?) For, This second *Judge*, and Reformer, and this Secular Magistrate are liable also to Heresies, Blasphemies, Idolatries: And then, how is there any remedy of these crimes and errours, unless there may be also a third Judge allowed to reform against them? and then, may not the *Superiors*, and *major* part, again, take their turn, to *reform* these *Reformers*? And, where will be an end of this *Controversie*, who shall last decide Controversies? Every Judge, that we can set up, being also a *party*, and so to leave his Chair, after that there appears another to question his judgment? But, if we are to stay in some judgment, to avoid such *confusion*, where, more reasonably can we rest, than in the three former Proposals?

† *Mr.* Stillingf. *p.* 478, 479.

§. 116. And from them it will follow. 1. That those who are no *Bishops*, must be content not to be *Judges*, or to have definitive votes, in Councils, and if any such have a controversie with, or against, Bishops, must be content, after their best informations preferr'd to the Order, to be judged by the same Bishops; who, 'tis probable, upon some new evidence, may alter their former sentences. But yet, suppose the *Inferior Clergy* admitted to have Definitive votes, I see not, what the *Protestants* can advantage themselves thereby, as long as, if any inferior Clergy, all, must have so; and the greater number, give law to the fewer: For the inferior *Catholick*-Clergy, in the time of the Council of *Trent*, far out-numbred the *Reformed*.

§. 117. 2. Again, from them it follows. That, if the Bishops are appointed the sole Judges of such matters and causes, they do not cease to be so upon any, either interest, or siding, which they may be shewed to have in the cause. And indeed, if we consider, * their former common Tenents, and practises in those things, which, upon some opposition, they meet afterward to judge; * to what side of a controversie the major part of them hath formerly inclined, or also declared for it, something of what they judge tending to their *Honour*, another to their *Profit*, another to their *Peace*, in some sence they may almost alwaies be said to judge in their own cause; or, on their own side. So, when ever they are divided into two opinions, or parties, who ever of them judgeth here, and none may judge beside them, judgeth in his own cause. And so it is, when any one opposeth the *Church* in any of her *Traditions*, or *Doctrines*, formerly owned by her:

For inſtance, when one oppoſeth the *Order of Biſhops*; the juſt *obligation* of the Churches *Decrees*; queſtioneth, * whether the Church-Governours, ſucceeding the Apoſtles, hold ſuch or ſuch their authority *immediatly* from Chriſt, independent on ſecular Princes? * Whether the receiving of Holy *Orders* be neceſſary for *adminiſtring* the Sacraments? * Whether Tithes be due, *jure divino*? In all theſe we muſt ſay, that the Church is appointed by God Judge in her own cauſe. Or if, in ſome of theſe things, not the Clergy, but the *Laity*, be the right Judge; yet ſo we ſtill make him, who judgeth, to judge in his own cauſe, and in a matter, wherein he is intereſſed; whilſt he ſo much gaineth in thoſe things; as the other loſeth. Of this matter, thus Mr. *Chellingw.*

† p. 60. † —*In controverſies of Religion, it is in a manner impoſsible to be avoided, but the Judge muſt be a party. For this muſt be the firſt* [Controverſie] *whether he be a Judge or no: and, in that he muſt be a party.*

§. 118. But now, ſuppoſe judging in their own cauſe muſt by no means be allowed to any; and ſo, the Church, about any difference, being divided into two Parties, and Communions, neither muſt judge, as both being parties; and theſe perhaps very unequal, I ask what courſe is left to end ſuch difference? 1. Shall either Party chuſe an *equal* number of Clergy with full authority to determine it? But theſe, having equal votes, will *counterpoiſe* one another, and ſo decide nothing. Or, ſuppoſe one or two ſhould, as it were, betray their truſt, and paſs over to the other ſide (for *truth* and *error*, are not capable of *moderating* the point, and compounding the middle doctrine between both, as many other litigious matters are) yet I think no party, eſpecially the major, will ever yield to commit the future profeſſion of their *Religion* to ſuch a *chance*. 2. Or, ſhall the Clergy on both ſides, firſt pleading their cauſe before them, caſt the judgment and deciſion thereof upon the *Laity*? But are not the *Laity*, in matter of Religion (which concerns all) all *parties*, as well as the *Churchmen*, and ranged, with the ſeveral diviſions of the Churchmen, in diſtinct communions? Will the Proteſtant be judged by the Emperour; or the Roman Catholick by the Duke of *Saxony*, becauſe a Layman? But if an *equal* number of Laicks, becauſe theſe alſo are parties, ſhall be choſen on both ſides, whether Princes or others, the ſame accidents recur, as in taking an *equal* number of Clergy. Bleſſed be God, who hath eſtabliſhed a firmer courſe for the perpetual ſettlement of the peace of his Church.

Neither

Neither belongs this courſe, of judging in their own cauſe, only to Eccleſiaſticks, but is found the ſame in the civil, *ſupreme*, power. I ſay, *ſupreme*: For, as for inferiour Judicatures, excluſion of parties from being Judges is eaſie, by reaſon of many both collateral, and ſuperior, Courts, which may be repaired to. For the ſupreme power then; when any difference happens between a Prince and his Subjects, part of his people adhering to him, part divided from him; when a part of his Kingdom rebelleth againſt him, oppoſeth ſome part of his Royal *Prerogatives*, or the equity and juſtice of ſome of his Laws. Here, 1. Either ſuch offence muſt not be judged; 2. Or, the ſupreme Magiſtrate, hearing the Plea of his Subjects, muſt judge in his own cauſe, either by *Himſelf*, or by his *Subſtitute*; which is all one, as if by himſelf: For he can give this Subſtitute no ſuch power to judge this cauſe, unleſs he have ſuch power himſelf: Again, it is to be preſumed, that ſuch *Subſtitute* ſhall be one of his own perſwaſions: and who will think themſelves any whit relieved by having their adverſary to nominate the perſon that ſhall judge the cauſe between him, and them? But if ſuch *Subſtitute*, by receiving new informations, may change his former judgment, ſo may the *Prince*, (hearing the cauſe himſelf, and being better informed) ſo much the ſooner he hoped to change his, as he hath no other above him, whom he is bound to obſerve 3. or, 3ly. The matter muſt be referred to the arbitrement of an equal number of both parties, ſo many loyal Subjects, and ſo many Rebels; but what good iſſue can be hoped of this? 4. or, laſtly, to the arbitrement of ſome neighbouring State: But neither may this State, being never without ſome *Intereſt* of its own, be thought an *impartial* Judge. Here then I conceive, that the conceſſion of the Statiſt will be, that the ſupreme Governour is to judge in his own cauſe, upon the penalty of *the divine revenge*, and publick infamy, if he judge amiſs; and then how is the ſame thing unjuſt in the Superior Governours of the Church? eſpecially, when as ſuch judgment of theirs is not valid, unleſs it be of a major part of them. §. 119.

It follows then, from what is here ſaid, that, in theſe Eccleſiaſtical Judgments, it is not to be conſidered, of what intereſt, or ſide, or how affected, theſe perſons are, that ſo, if oppoſit to us, we may decline their Tribunal, who are by Chriſt appointed to judge; but, to what ſide it is, to which the prevalent, and major part of them is inclined, and ſo this to be conformed to; and any parties appealing to a General Council, as hoping from it a juſtification of their cauſe, is nothing elſe, than the alledging, that §. 120.

the major part of Chriſtian Biſhops are already, or will, when met and arguing the caſe, be of their perſwaſion. And, for the *Appellants*, when they ſee the other party, in ſuch Council, far outnumbers theirs, to requeſt or caution, this *General Council* may be compoſed of an equal number of both ſides, is, in effect, to *appeale from it*, and to deſire that the Council ſhould not be *General*.

§. 121. This ſaid (from §. 114.) That Biſhops, the ordinary Judges in matters of Religion; though they ſhould be parties in ſome ſence, and, in the things to be brought before them, already declared in their preſent judgment on one ſide, yet are not therefore ſtreight to quit the Chair, and ceaſe to diſcharge their office: Eſpecially where the points controverted are meerly ſpeculative, and abſtracted from all ſecular gain, and advantage, as many of thoſe decided in *Trent* were.

2. 2. Next, to the Proteſtants Articles, and Exceptions made more particularly, againſt the *Pope*, and his *Court*; in reſpect of which, they would have had him at leaſt excluded from being a Judge in in this Council of *Trent*: I anſwer.

§. 122. 1. 1. That he cannot be ſaid to have been the *ſole* Judge in theſe matters; but only to have *preſided* in that Court, which was ſo: which he hath done often in former allowed Councils, when also he was a Perſon accuſed by a Party. || For every unweighty accuſation is not enough to remove the Judge from the Bench, or alter the uſual courſe of Juſtice.

|| See §. 114.

§. 123. 2. 2. Whatever *Declaration*, *Sentence*, or Cenſure, of a Council, this *ſupreme* Biſhop, and *Preſident* thereof, in ſome extraordinary Delinquencies (if poſſible theſe ſhould happen) may be liable to, as in caſe of *Hereſie*, or ſome other *incorrigible tyranny*, or heinous *Crimes*, or alſo in his *neglect*, when, ſo obnoxious, to call a Council, *&c.* in which caſes ſome Roman Divines, that ſeem no diminiſhers of the *Popes* priviledges, do freely allow as much, as can rationally be required [As, if you have the curioſity, you may ſee in theſe places of *Bellarmin*; both, in caſe of his neglect in calling a Council.—*De Concil. l. 1. c. 14. §. Ad ſecundum*: and, when the Council is called, in caſe of *Hereſie*, or other incorrigible Crime—*Ib. c. 9. §. Quarta cauſa*; (where alſo the Cardinal urgeth the 21. Canon of the 8th General Council.—*Debent Generalia Concilia cognoſcere controverſias circa Rom. Pontificem exortas.*) —*De Concil. l. 2. c. 19 §. Primum exemplum*—*De Rom. Pontif. l. 2. c. 30. Tertia Opinio.*] Or, whether it be ſtated rather; that, He having no *Superior* Judge, ſuch Enormities are for a time

to

to be ſuffered in this *Eccleſiaſtical Supreme* (as the like miſdemeanours in *Secular* matters, are tolerated in the *Civil*) till God, whoſe vigilant providence never deſerts his Church, either *converts* Him, or *removes* Him; I ſay, however theſe things be ſtated; yet as to our preſent buſineſs of *Trent*, neither did the Pope, out of any ſuch *private* guilt of *Hereſie*, or other *Crime*, forbear to call this Council; nor, when it was aſſembled, and the *Proteſtants* complaints againſt the Pope well known, did this ſupreme Court find any ground, or cauſe of ſuch extraordinary proceedings againſt him. For 1ſt. For his *Preſidentſhip* in the Council, which was excepted againſt, how could the Council deprive him of this right, which was no new tyranny, or device, but that office, which his Predeceſſors had anciently exerciſed in the moſt unblemiſhed Councils, which the Church ever had: Of which, ſee what is ſaid before, §. 46. *&c.* And, as for any *falſe* doctrines, *crimes*, or *corruptions*, charged on Him, this Council found none valid, as to his own perſon, either, for removal of Him from ſuch Preſidentſhip, or Depoſition from his Dignity Pontifical.

§. 124.

Many corruptions indeed, and great need of Reformation of ſeveral things, both in the Church, and in the Court of *Rome*, as the Proteſtants complain'd of, ſo the *Council*, and alſo the *Pope* himſelf, acknowledged. And, in the remedying of theſe, the Council ſpent the longer part of their Acts; which have been not *meerly deluſory*, as a late Writer would blaſt them † (who muſt one day give account to the celeſtial Majeſty of his *ſpeaking evil* of ſo *ſacred* an *Authority*:) but very *effective*, as to the having produced a vigorous, and during *Reformation* in the *Roman* Church; and that, of the chiefeſt diſorders complain'd of; as is ſhewed more particularly below, §. 203. *&c.* And this *real effect* it was, which with an holy envy, the *Clergy* of *France*, diſcovered in other Catholick Countries, and which made them ſo importunate with the *King*, and *State* of *France*, to give them there the like force; and, that this Kingdom alone might not be deprived of ſo great a benefit. † And ſo much were theſe ſevere Decrees reſented, and dreaded in the *Court* of *Rome*, that *Soave* † reports — *That this Reformation was oppoſed by almoſt all the Officers of this Court, repreſenting their loſſes, and prejudices, and ſhewing how all would redound to the offence of his Holineſs, and of the Apoſtolick See, and diminution of his Revenues.* Of which, ſee much more below, §. 204. This, in the ſecond place, that the *Council*, who is only proper Judge of this Head of the Church (if any ſo be) and of theſe matters, found no ſuch weighty accuſation againſt the *Popes* perſon, as might juſtly abridge any of his priviledges therein:

† *Stillingf.* Rat. Account. p 482.

† See §. 77. *&c.*

† p. 8, 6.

therein: nor, that any Reformation, in the Church, or Court, was obſtructed by his Authority.

§. 125. 3. 3. Laſtly. Neither doth the Popes calling, or declaring the *Lutherans*, *Hereticks*, before the ſitting of this Council, render him uncapable of being *one* of their *Judges* in it: For this prime Governour in the Church is not a Judge of *hereſie* only in the Council; and other Popes, as the fore-mentioned *Celeſtine* and *Leo*, having formerly declared againſt the errors of *Neſtorius* and *Dioſcorus*, yet afterward, approvedly, preſided in Councils, and there again condemned them. But much more might the Pope call the Lutherans, Hereticks, without ſhew of wrong, if ſo be that their tenents, or ſome of them, had been determined againſt, and condemned, in former lawful Councils: as Pope *Leo* 10 in *Bull.* 8. *Jun.* 1520. pretended they were: For, if the opinion be formerly concluded *hereſie*, thoſe who own it, without a new proceſs, may be pronounced *Hereticks*. Now tis clear, that ſome of the Proteſtant tenents were condemned, in the 2*d. Nicene*, in the 8. *G.* Council, in the *Lateran*, under *Innocent* 3. in that of *Florence*, in that of *Conſtance* || Add to this, * that *Leo* the 10th, who ſent forth a formal Decree againſt *Luther*, and his followers, to be proceeded againſt as *Hereticks*, was deceaſed before this Council, and preſided not in it; * that *Paul the* 3*d.* who firſt preſided in this Council, did not formerly paſs any formal ſentence againſt the *Lutherans*, or *Hereticks*; but only, in his Bull concerning Reformation of the Court of *Rome*, *Obiter* named them ſo, which cannot have the vertue of a judicatory Decree; yet, in his laſt Bull of the Indiction of the Council in *Trent*, forbears alſo to name them ſo: * That *Pius the* 4*th*, who renewed the Council, and concluded it, was abſolutely free from giving them this offence, therefore the Acts, at leaſt under him (enough to condemn them) are not, upon this pretence, to be invalidated. But here it muſt not be forgotten; that not only the Pope, but the Emperour, the King of *France*, and, ſometime, the King of *England*, *Henry* the 8*th*, before the Council, pronounced them *Hereticks*; publiſhed Edicts, and denounced heavy puniſhments, againſt them; and yet, afterward they did not, for this, utterly decline theſe Princes judgments, as hoping that ſuch proceedings might be, upon better informations, and ſecond conſiderations, reverſible.

|| See below §. 198.

§. 126. † Mr. *Stillingf.* Rat. Accoun. p. 492.

To the queſtion, asked here, †—*If the Proteſtant opinions were condemned for Hereſies before, by General Councils, why was the Council of* Trent *at all ſummoned?* It is eaſily anſwered,

1ſt. That

1ſt. That though many of the Proteſtant tenents had been conſidered, and condemned in former Councils, yet not all, becauſe ſome of them not then appearing. 2ly. Had all been ſo: yet, that it is not unuſual both to Eccleſiaſtical, and Civil Courts, to reiterate their ſentence; and by new Declarations (and perhaps new reaſons too) to enforce their former Laws, and Decrees, ſo long as a conſiderable party continues to gain-ſay, and diſobey, them; whereby is yielded alſo a Teſtimony to the world, that the preſent Church Governours perſevere both in the *faith* of their Predeceſſors, and in their *Reſolution*, for the maintainance thereof. So Arianiſm, after the *Nicen*, was condemned again, by way of a continued Teſtimony to the truth of Conſubſtantiality, by the Council of *Sardica*; and *Berengarius*, and his party being condemned by five ſeveral Councils, before the great *Lateran*, and that of *Florence*, yet did not theſe forbear to reiterate the *condemnation*, ſo long as others continued to maintain the *Hereſie*.

CHAP. VIII.

II. Head. *The Invalidity of ſuch a Council, as Proteſtants demanded.*

The Proteſtant-Demands, §. 127.
The unreaſonableneſs of theſe Demands, §. 132.
Where,
Of the fruitleſneſs of many Diets (framed according to the Proteſtant-Propoſals) to decide their Controverſies.

§. 127.

THus much from §. 53. of the *firſt* General Head I propoſed (§. 8.) concerning the ſufficient *generality* of this *Council*, to render it obligatory. Now I paſs to the *ſecond*; concerning the novelty, canonical invalidity, and probably, ineffectiveneſs (as to their carrying the cauſe) of ſuch a General Council, as the *Proteſtants* demanded in ſtead of that of *Trent*, and as ſhould be regulated with all their Conditions.

Luther, the firſt *Parent* of this new *Sect*, being queſtioned for his Doctrines, and upon this cited to *Rome*, firſt made Friends to have his cauſe tried in *Germany*; having been heard and condemned in *Germany* (by Cardinal *Cajetan*, for one, a moderat and learned Prelat) he now appeal'd to *Rome*, and to the *Pope*. But well perceiving, that his Doctrine would alſo be moſt certainly condemned there, as it was: he ſuddainly intercepted this Appeal with

† See *Adam vitæ Lutheri.* with another, † made from the *Pope* to a *Council*; having ſome ground to imagine, that ſuch a *Body* would never be conven'd to hear his cauſe, nor the Pope call them together, from whom was expected a ſevere *Reformation* of *Him*, and his *Court*. But afterward, ſeeing that in good earneſt ſuch a Council there would be (for a Bull was publiſhed for one to be held at *Vicenza*, in 1537.) and well diſcerning, that neither thus (the uſual former laws of Councils being obſerved: or only this law of all Aſſemblies; that the much *major* part ſhall conclude the *whole*) his Doctrine could ſtand (as indeed it did not) He began now to vilifie Councils, and put out a book *De Conciliis*, in, 1539. wherein he declares, no good, but much hurt to have come to the Church by thoſe that had been held formerly; not ſparing the very *Firſt*, reverenced by the whole Chriſtian world; not that of *Nice*; not that of the Apoſtles, *Act.* c. 15. Some of his Invectives I have ſet down already, in *Diſc.* 3. §. 78. *n.* 3. and ſo here forbear to repeat them. Upon this therefore his laſt Appeale was from *Councils* to the *Holy Scriptures* (defending himſelf with a — *Si Angelus de Cœlo,* || *Matt.* 17. Gal. 1 8. — *Attendite à falſis Prophetis* || — *Oves meæ vocem meam audiunt.* † — *Omnia probantes,* || &c.) And here he knew himſelf ſafe (as 15. † *Jo.* 10. any *Hereſie*, though never ſo abſurd, would be) in chuſing that to || 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 21. be the *Judge*, or decider of the Controverſie, which could never deliver any *new* ſentence on any ſide; and where the meaning of its former *Sentence* deliver'd already, which all will ſtand to were it known, is the *controverſie* to be decided.

But his followers, rather than utterly to decline a *Council*, which they had formerly, to avoid the ſtanding *Church-authorities*, often called for, thought fit to change the ancient form thereof, and to clog it with ſuch *Conditions*, as, if accepted, ſhould perfectly ſecure them from any danger from it. Now the Conditions, as they are moſt fully ſet down in *Soave*, p. 642. though often mentioned elſe-

† See *Soave*, *p.* 18, 65, 80. where, † are theſe. 1. *That it ſhould not be called by the* Pope. 2. *That it ſhould be celebrated in* Germany, *according to the Canon,* ut illic lites terminentur, ubi exortæ ſunt. 3. *That the Pope ſhould not* preſide *in, but only be part of, the* Council, *and ſubject to* 1. — 2 — 3. 4. *the determinations thereof.* 4. *That the Biſhops ſhould be free from their* Oath *given to the Pope, that ſo they may freely, and without impediment, deliver their opinions.* 5. *That the* Proteſtant 5. Divines, *ſent to the Council, might have a* deciding *voice with the* 6. *reſt.* 6. *That the* Holy Scriptures *might be* judge *in the Council, and all* humane *authority excluded.*

§. 128. Where note; that, by humane authority, they would exclude, amongſt other things, *Apoſtolorum traditiones, Concilia, & authoritates*

authoritates S. Patrum: Which, together with the Holy Scriptures (as neceſſary to know the true meaning of them, where it is diſputed) was the Rule that the Council entertained, to decide preſent controverſies by. Of which ſee *Soave*, *l.* 4. *p.* 344. and 323. where he ſaith; the Council preſcribed this *Rule* to the *Divines*, in their diſputations about the Articles propoſed to them, *That they ought to confirm their opinions with the Holy Scriptures, Traditions of the Apoſtles, ſacred and approved Councils, and by the Conſtitutions and Authorities of the Holy Fathers; to avoid ſuperfluous and unprofitable queſtions, and perverſe contentions.* Which rule to judge controverſies by, was alſo mentioned in the Safe-conduct.—*Quod cauſa controverſa ſecundum Scripturam, & Apoſtolorum traditiones, probata Concilia, Catholicæ Eccleſiæ conſenſum, & S. Patrum authoritates tractentur in prædicto Concilio*: and which alſo long before this, was mentioned, in the beginning of the Council, *Seſſ.* 4. where a Decree was made.—*Ad coercenda petulantia ingenia; ut nemo, ſuæ prudentiæ innixus in rebus fidei, &c. ſcripturam ſacram interpretari audeat contra eum ſenſum, quem tenuit, & tenet, ſancta mater eccleſia, aut etiam contra unanimem conſenſum Patrum.* And ſuch an advice and rule as this, we find given, not long after the ſecond General Council, to *Theodoſius* the Emperour in a time much over-run with divers Hereſies: which Emperour thinking, that all *Sects* might eaſily be united in the Truth, by convocating them all together, and permitting a free *Diſputation*; *Nectarius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, with others, rather perſwaded him to take this courſe.—*Ut fugeret* [to give you it in *Sozomen*'s words ||] *inſtitutas cum ſectariis diſputationes, utpote rixarum atq; pugnarum fomites: Sed ex ipſis quæreret, reciperent ne eos, qui, ante eccleſiæ diſtractionem, interpretes, ac Doctores fuiſſent Scripturæ ſacræ? Etenim, ſi horum Teſtimonia rejecerint, à ſuis ipſorum conſortibus explodentur, ſin autem ſufficere eos ad controverſias decidendas arbitrabuntur, produci oportet eorum libros, &c.* By which books they would ſoon be convinced of their errour; which advice the Pious Emperour commending, and propoſing this way of ending Controverſie to the Heads of the Sectaries, they ſoon diſcovered to him their Tergiverſation; and He there upon authorizing only the Catholick Religion, vigorouſly undertook the ſuppreſſion of the reſt. Suitable to this; among thoſe General Propoſals, made by the Pope's *Nuncio's* in *Germany*, and elſewhere, before the ſitting of this Council, this was the firſt. † —*That the Council might be free, and be celebrated in the manner uſed by the Church, even from the beginning of the firſt General Councils*, and the ſecond. *That all thoſe, who met in the Council,*

|| *Sozom. l.* 7. *c* 12. *Socrat. l.* 5. *c.* 10.

† *Pallavic. l.* 3. *c.* 13. *n.* 2. *Soave p.* 64.

ſhould engage to ſubmit to the Decrees thereof. Things to which the Proteſtants would no way conſent. The clauſe contained in the Safe-conduct of deciding controverſies, *per probata Concilia*, &c. they excepted againſt (ſee *Soave*. p. 344, and 372, and before, §. 104.) and they refuſed alſo to ſtand to any Council, that ſhould proceed as the uſe had been for 800 years before. † Here, then, at that time thus the caſe ſtood, The Pope, and the *Tridentine Fathers* were for *admitting*; the *Proteſtants* for *excluding*, the Form a of Council agreeable with the former: and again, the one for admitting; the other for excluding, a trial in this Council, as formerly, by *Church-Tradition*, *Councils*, and *Fathers*, interpreting Scriptures controverted. But, now the Learned amongſt the Reformed, perhaps like the ancient Sectariſts, but now mentioned, *ne à ſuis ipſorum conſortibus explodantur*, think fit to take another way, and do profeſs their doctrines to be confirmed, as the Roman, overthrown, by thoſe ſame ancient *Councils* and *Fathers*. Whereby we are now made believe, that theſe their Fore-Fathers mainly *declined* that Authority, which clearly *eſtabliſhed* their opinions; and, on the otherſide, the Roman Catholicks, together with the Pope, vehemently contended for that Authority, that manifeſtly ruined theirs.]

† *Soave*, p. 18.

§. 129. 7. 8.

7. Their ſeventh condition ſuitably was, *That the deciſions in Council ſhould not be made by* plurality *of voices, but that the more ſound opinions ſhould be preferred*; i. e. *thoſe opinions, which were regulated by the word of God.* 8. *That if a* concord *in* Religion *cannot be concluded in the* Council [*i. e.* if the Proteſtants do not conſent to what the reſt of the Council approve] *the conditions of* Paſſau *may remain inviolable*; *and the peace of Religion made in* Auſburg, *A. D.* 1555. *continue in force.* [Now the conditions agreed on in *Paſſau* and *Auſburg* between the Emperour and Proteſtants, were, *A toleration of all ſects*; *that every one might follow what religion pleaſeth them beſt*: as you may ſee in *Soave*, p. 378. and 393.]

§. 130.

The ſum therefore of the fifth, ſeventh, and eighth condition, is this. Of the Fifth, that *Proteſtants* ſhall vote in the Council *definitively* together with the *Catholicks*; but this, the Proteſtants muſt needs ſee, by the Catholicks over-numbring them, would ſignifie little: Therefore the ſeventh condition cautioneth, that, if there be more votes againſt the Proteſtant-tenents, than for them; yet this *plurality* may not carry the buſineſs; but, that their opinion, if the *more ſound*, though it have fewer Suffrages, ſhall be preferred. But again, this they ſaw was very unlikely; either that the others, who voted againſt their opinion,

ſhould

ſhould judge it the more ſound, or, themſelves only judging it more ſound, that the others upon this ſhould preſer it. Therefore the 8th. condition makes ſure work: that, if the reſt of the Council will not prefer the Proteſtant-opinions, yet they ſhall not condemn, but allow every one, that pleaſeth, ſtill to retain, them: and on theſe *conditions* they will ſubmit to a *Council*

§. 131. 9. And there was beſides theſe yet another Proteſtant-Propoſal made, which ſee in *Soave*, p. 369.—*That the Proteſtant doctrines being repugnant to thoſe of the Pope, and of the Biſhops his adherents; and it being unjuſt, that either the* Plaintiff, *or the* Defendent, *ſhould be the judge, therefore that, the* Divines *on one part and on the other arguing for their tenets, there might be* Judges *indifferently choſen by both ſides, to take knowledge of the controverſies.*

§. 132. In ſatisfaction to theſe their demands. To the firſt, ſee what is ſaid above, §. 47. and §. 80. To 1.

To the ſecond, what is ſaid §. 83. *&c.* To the Canon urged, See *Bellarmins* anſwer, *de Concil. l.* 1. *c.* 21. The Canon intends *criminal* matters, where witneſſes are neceſſary; not matters of *faith*. The controverſie ariſing in *Antioch* was judged at *Jeruſalem*; Arianiſm ariſing in *Alexandria*, judged at *Nice* in *Bithynia*. To 2.

To the third, ſee what is ſaid before, §. 114. and 122. And me thinks the Emperours anſwer returned to it (in *Soave*, p. 80.) is ſufficient.—*That in caſe the Proteſtants had any complaint againſt the Pope they might modeſtly proſecute it in the Council* [to which it belongs, according to the 21. Canon of the 8th. General Council, recited before, *cognoſcere controverſias circa Romanum Pontificem exortas*] *And, that for the manner and Form, it was not convenient, that they ſhould preſcribe it to all Nations, not think their Devines only inſpired by God*, &c. To 3.

To the fourth, what is ſaid, §. 105. *&c.* And; that, *de facto*, ſuch Oath reſtrained not the Councils freedom, was ſeen in ſeveral controverſies, that were hotly agitated in the Council between the Popes, and a contrary party, about *Epiſcopal Juriſdiction*, &c. To 4.

To the fifth, what is ſaid, §. 68. *n.* 2.—115. *&c.*—and 118. where it is alſo ſhewed, by the ſuppoſitions there made, that had ſuch *deciſive vote* been granted to the *Proteſtants*, it would have nothing promoted their cauſe; unleſs perhaps they think, that the evident *arguments*, which the reformed would there have manifeſted for the truth of their tenents, would have converted ſo many of their adverſaries, as, joyned with them, would have made a *major* part in the Council. But, beſides theſe arguments To 5.

ſeen, and diligently examin'd by divers of the Council, in their *books* (who alſo gathered out of theſe books the dangerous doctrines fit to be condemned) without working any ſuch effect upon them, what ſucceſs their diſputations would have had in the *Council*, may be gathered, * from that which they had in the *German Diets*; from which their Catholick Antagoniſts departed ſtill as conſtant, and inflexible in their former perſwaſions, as themſelves: and * from that effect which they have in *Chriſtendome*, ever ſince that Council, to this day; the major part undeniably, remaining ſtill Catholick; and the other of late much decreaſing.

§. 313. To 6. To the ſixth, I have ſaid much elſewhere; which you may remember. 1. Surely, nothing can be more reaſonable and juſt, when the ſenſe of the *Holy Scriptures* between two oppoſit parties is the thing queſtioned and doubted of, than that the litigants, for what is either ſaid in the Scriptures, or neceſſarily deduced from them, ſtand to the judgment and the expoſitions of the former *Fathers* and *Councils* of the Church: and he, that diſclaims to be tried by theſe concerning the controverted ſenſe of Scriptures, doth me thinks ſufficiently acknowledge, that theſe Fathers, and Councils, are againſt him; and this again ſeems a ſufficient *autocatacriſie.*—*When you and I differ upon the interpre-*

† 3d. Paper. *tation of Scripture* (ſaith King *Charles* † of bleſſed memory, to his weak Antagoniſt, Mr. *Henderſon*) *and I appeale to the practice of the primitive Church, and the univerſal conſent of Fathers to be judge between us; me thinks you ſhould either find a fitter, or ſubmit to what I offer. Neither have you ſhewn how, waving thoſe Judges I appeale unto, the miſchief of the interpretation by private ſpirits can be pre-*

† 4th Paper. *vented*—and again. †—*When we differ about the meaning of the Scripture, certainly there ought to be for this, as well as other things, a rule, or a Judge between us to determine our differences.* Thus, againſt Puritans, againſt Socinians, *&c.* the Church of *England* ſees moſt clearly thoſe things, wherein her eyes are ſhut, againſt Catholicks. But, ſet this *humane Authority* quite aſide, the ſame words of Scripture being diverſly interpreted by two ſides, the *Scripture* can no more judge on the Proteſtant ſide, than on the other, becauſe it ſaith only the ſame words to, or for, both; and thus, as, by other *humane authority* allowed, the Catholicks will have the victory; ſo, *Scripture* being the ſole Judge, the Proteſtant can have no conqueſt, but the contention will ſtill be depending. (So the King, *Ibid.*)—*We muſt find ſome Rule to judge betwixt us, when you and I differ upon the interpretation of the ſelf-ſame Text, or it can never determine our queſtion.* As we ſee amongſt the reformed alſo of thoſe daies, that, the Scriptures being made ſole judge or rule to

try

try their doctrines by, yet by it could they not, then, accord the differences amongst themselves; how then might they hope by it solely to decide the differences between them, and the Roman Catholicks? 2. Again; * It is yet more unreasonable and unjust; so to bind over the Council, or the Church, to the test of Scripture, as that all their *Constitutions*, or *Injunctions*, shall be cassated, and rejected, if not shewed to be commanded also in *Scripture*. It is sufficient, that such Injunctions cannot be shewn, by the adverse party, to be *against Scripture*. For the Church hath power in things indifferent: And so much, as is not prohibited, is lawful.

§ 134. To 7.

To the Seventh, it is easily granted; that the *more sound* opinion be preferred, but, taking away *plurality* of votes in the Council, the supreme Judge in these matters, and what course shall be used to judge, or decide, which opinion is the more sound? See the unsufficiency of those waies proposed, §. 115. *n.* 2. and 118. *&c.*

To 8.

To the Eighth, What is this, but saying, that they will be judged by a *Council*, upon condition, that the Council will judge either for, or not against *them?* And what a ridiculous thing would it seem even to a Protestant, if any opinion, which they dislike (suppose the Arrian, or Nestorian) should have thus capitulated before hand with Councils, and yielded to be examined by them, after it hath first tyed their hands, to decree nothing against it?

§. 135. To 9.

In satisfaction to the Ninth, concerning an equal number on both sides to determine their controversies, see what is said above, §. 118. And besides, that this seems not appealing to the judgment of a *General Council*, but rather, from it, to a *private Committee*; and that it is no more reasonable to propose this, than that an equal number of Arrians, and Anti-Arrians, should judge of Arrianisme; the experiment of this device in so many *Diets* of *Germany*, still fruitless, shews, it would have been so also in *Trent*.

And here, 'Tis worth your diversion to view a little with me the unsatisfying issue of those many *Diets*.

§. 136.

The Emperour, sometimes from the pressing of forreign war (from the Turk, who in those times frequently alarm'd *Germany*, to the great growth of Protestancy) sometimes for fear of civil; or, from some discords arising with neighbouring Princes, exceedingly desirous to settle a peace in *Germany*, had many *Conferences* and *Diets*, in several places, for composing the differences in Religion.

A. D.

Diet, 1530. A. D. 1530. Was held a Diet at *Auſburg*; where the *Proteſtants* exhibited the Confeſſion of their faith, called the *Auguſtan* Confeſſion, and here ſeven *Catholicks*, and ſeven *Proteſtants* (on either ſide, two Princes, two Lawyers, and three Divines) were choſen to confer together, and find out a means of compoſition: and, theſe not being able to agree, afterward the number was reſtrained to three a piece. *But* (ſaith *Soave*, *l.* 1. *p.* 56.) *though ſome few ſmall points of doctrine, and other petty things belonging to ſome rites, were agreed on; yet, in concluſion, it was perceived, that the Conference could produce no concord at all; becauſe neither party was willing to grant to the other any thing of importance.* Or, if any thing of importance was there yielded, it was by the Proteſtant party, for which ſee, *Pall*: *l.* 3. *c.* 4.

§. 137. *Diet*, 1541. A. D. 1541. Was held a Conference at *Ratiſbon*, where, the Emperour himſelf being preſent, and two Preſidents, of the Colloquy appointed, three *Catholick*, and three *Proteſtant* Divines were choſen to determine and compoſe the differences; and *Calvin* was preſent at it, though not yet much noted: 22. *Articles* were drawn up by ſome Catholicks, and propoſed by the Emperour, as an argument and ſubject of what they ought to treat: and in theſe *Articles*, and in thoſe afterward, of the *Interim*, was the neareſt approach made to any agreement, ſince the Reformation: and the accord here made concerning *Juſtification*, is worth your reading, the Catholick party purpoſely omitting the word [*Merit*] that they might not give an offence in the expreſſion; where both agreed in the ſenſe. See *Pall. l.* 4. *c.* 14. *n.* 8. Yet of theſe 22. thoſe Articles, which contained the things moſt controverted, could not be agreed on: [Amongſt which, theſe: *De ſummè venerando ſacramento veri corporis, & ſanguinis Chriſti: & de hujus adoratione & reſervatione. De tranſubſtantiatione panis & vini. De miſſâ. De conjugio ſacerdotum. De communione ſacramenti ſub utraq; ſpecie. De panitentiâ, Confeſſione, & Satisfactione. De invocatione ſanctorum. De eccleſiæ Hierarchico ordine. De eccleſiæ & Conciliorum authoritate*, and ſeveral others.] And the other few that were agreed on; as, *De libero Arbitrio. De Originali peccato. De juſtificatione hominis. De panitentia poſt lapſum*, &c. were by both parties afterward diverſly expounded, and equally complained of, as *perplexed* and *ambiguous*, and not clearly expreſſing the Truth; and particularly, by the Catholick party; as changing the former Church-language; and alſo ſtating ſuch evident matters, as were no way formerly controverted amongſt the learned. (See *Reſponſum Principum Proteſtantium*, penn'd by *P. Melanthon* —and *Reſponſum Principum, qui Rom. Pontificem agnoſcunt.*) And

ſo

ſo this meeting ended without effecting a peace. See *Soave, l. 1. p.* 95.

§. 138. These meetings were before the Council of *Trent*. Afterward, in the time of the Council, 1546. was another Colloquy appointed at *Ratisbone*, *four* Divines on a ſide, and two Judges, *But no good fruit grew thereof* (ſaith *Soave, l. 2. p.* 148.) *by reaſon of the ſuſpicions, which one part conceived againſt the other; and becauſe the Catholicks omitted no occaſions to give greater jealouſies to the other ſide, and to fain them of their own, which finally made the Colloquy to diſſolve.* Thus *Soave*, blaming the Catholicks; but ſee *Spondanus* † and the Authors he cites, charging the fault on the Proteſtant ſide, deſerting the Colloquy, recalled by the Princes that ſent them.

Diet, 1546.

† *A. D.* 1546. *n.* 10.

§. 139. After this, A.D. 1547. upon the Emperours great victory obtained over the Proteſtants, and no hopes of the Councils return from *Bologna*, (whither it was removed by reaſon of the Plague) to *Trent*, a *Diet* was held at *Auſburg*, where the Emperour, reſolving; before he diſarmed, to ſet *Germany* at peace in matters of Religion, elected *three*, two of them Catholicks, the third, *Joannes Agricola Iſlebius*, a moderate Proteſtant; or one, that had been ſo, but who was now turned to the Catholick Profeſſion, † to compoſe or peruſe a new moderated *form* of *Religion*, commonly called the *Interim*, which was afterwards alſo reviewed, and changed by many others, ſome of the principal Miniſters of the Proteſtants being alſo called, that they might approve it, † amongſt whom, *Bucer*. It contained 25. *heads*, beſides other heads of *Reformation*; preſcribing what men were to believe, until all ſhould be eſtabliſhed by a General Council. If you would know the temper of this famous draught; *Pallavacin* (in *l.* 10. *c.* 17. *n.* 1.) gives this account of it,—*That in many of the Articles, and eſpecially in thoſe concerning the Sacraments, this writing contradicted the Lutheran errors; but, that, in the reſt, it was a contexture of ambiguous forms, ſuch as each party might interpret to his own liking. Whence the three ſupervi ſers of it gave in this relation; that, rightly underſtood, it did in nothing oppoſe the Catholick doctrines, excepting that Marriage of Prieſts, and the Communion of the cup were therein permitted; yet ſo, as not there approved for lawful, but tolerated till a General Council ſhould decree, what was moſt fit to be done therein.*

Diet, 1547.

† *Spondan.* A. D. 1558. *n.* 4.

† *Soave, p.* 288.

§. 139. *n.* 2. In this Inſtrument chiefly was experimented, both what Union and Peace, a *Confeſsion* of *Faith*, compoſed in general, and ambiguous terms for men of contrary perſwaſions, was able to produce: And what ſatisfaction a Toleration of the *Cup*, and of *Prieſts marriage*, might give to the Proteſtants,

testants, to induce them happily to a compliance with Catholicks in other Points. And it was found, that nothing was promoted hereby. Many *Exceptions Catholicks* took at several of these Articles (which see collected by *Soave*, p. 289.) and *Protestants, more*: who also pleaded †—That it was a matter concerning their Conscience, and that therein they might not be forced. Generally, all sides contended to have the Profession of their Faith more clear, distinct, and particular. And—*In a short time* (saith *Soave*) †) *there was, as it were, a whole Squadron of Writers against it: Catholicks and Protestants* [amongst whom *Calvin*] *And that did follow, which doth ordinarily happen to him, that will reconcile contrary Opinions, that he maketh them both agree to oppugn his; and every one more obstinate in defending his own.* And the Composers thereof (saith *Spondanus*†) *Illud suis commixtionibus ac palpationibus assecuti sunt, ut neq; Protestantibus, Lutheranis, neq; ullis aliis Hæreticis, neq, Catholicis probatum fuerit ipsorum opus.* Only from this *Interim* there arose *two Sects* amongst the Protestants; one (being more under *Cesar's* power) embracing, and so justifying the use of some old Ceremonies required by him, called therefore, *Adiaphoristæ*; which the others, that were free from *Cesar's* power disallowed. See, *Soave*, Ibid.

†*Soave*, p. 305.

†*p.* 295.

† A.D. 1548. *n.* 5.

But so it was; That, after the yoke of this *State-compositi-* §. 139. *n* 3. *on* of Religion had been for three or four years, impatiently born by both parties; As, upon the Emperours victory over the Protestants, *A. D.* 1547, it was set up and imposed: so by another victory of the Protestants over Him, in 1552. when also the Council was dispersed, † it was quite thrown off: And, the Emperours former prosperous fortune, from this very time of his setting up the *Interim*, more and more declining, some stick not to impute it to this his usurping, being a *Laick*, such a supreme Arbitration in matters of *Religion*.

§. 140. So, A. D. 1552, was an agreement made, after the Emperour's ill success, of a mutual Toleration in the States of the German Princes, each mean while following which pleased him best, of both Religions: *viz.* the *Catholick*, and that of the *Augustan Confession*, or the *Lutheran*: all other Protestant *new* Sects, as more distant from the Catholick, being excluded: With which Sects, *Germany*, and other parts were now much afflicted, these still removing further, and further, from the former Catholick Faith. Some of which new Sects, at least it was hoped, by this means also might the easilyer be suppressed. And this *Concord* was made, till a further settlement of Religion, and union of Opinions could be procured by one of these *four* means: 1. A

General

General Council (for the ſitting of that of *Trent* was now broken up) Or, 2. A *National*: or, 3. a *Colloquy*: or, 4. an *Univerſal Diet* of the Empire.

There followed after this, A. D 1555. during the Suſpenſion of the Council of *Trent*, a renewed Attempt, in another *Diet* at *Auſburg*, to put ſome of the forementioned waies for accommodating matters of Religion in execution. *But* (ſaith *Soave* †) *two propoſals being made: One, to treat of the* means *of Reforming Religion: the other, to leave every one to his* Liberty, *not knowing, how to root out the evil humors, which did ſtill move, all inclined to the* ſecond *propoſition* [the continuation of a toleration] Of which Toleration, ſee the Articles ſet down in *Pallavicin l.* 13. *c.* 13. *n.* 4. §. 141. 1555. † p. 393, 389.

A. D. 1557. During the ſame Suſpenſion of the Council, yet another attempt was made. And of the *four* waies, named before, the *third* was pitched upon, a *Colloquy*, to be held at *Wormes*. Wherein was appointed a Conference of *twelve Catholick*, and *twelve Proteſtant* Divines on a ſide, the Biſhop of *Naumburg* being Preſident. The Collocutors met, here firſt a Diſputation was ſet on foot, *De Norma Judicii*: † The Catholicks, beſides the Scriptures, requiring, for Deciſion of Controverſies, the Interpretation of the *Fathers*, and *Ancient* Church; the Proteſtants admitting only the *Scriptures*. Next, it was propoſed, That, ſince all other Proteſtant Sects were excluded from a Toleration, ſave only thoſe of the *Auguſtan Confeſſion*, the Collocutors ſhould firſt declare themſelves, as to the condemning and rejecting thoſe other Sects, the *Zuinglians*, *Oſiandrians*, &c. in many things, and particularly in the main *doctrine* touching the *Euchariſt*, much more diſtant from the Roman Catholick Religion, than thoſe of the Auguſtan Confeſſion were. To this motion *five* of the Proteſtant Divines willingly agreed, and gave up their *Declaration* herein to the Preſident. But the other ſeven, amongſt whom was *Melancthon*, oppoſed it. And the difference between them, and the other five, grew ſo high, that theſe later departed from the Colloquy, and ſo it was diſſolv'd. And this was the laſt *Colloquy*, or Compoſition of Religion, that was aſſayed in *Germany*, I mean, between the *Proteſtant* and *Catholick* Party: The Proteſtant-differences among themſelves, which ſtill grew more, and could never ſince be healed, hindring any further Treaties of their accord with Catholicks (who expected their fall, at leaſt by their own hands.) And all theſe aſſayes of ſettling Religion by the *State*, and not by the *Eccleſiaſtical Authority*, that is the ordinary Judge thereof, thus proved vain and fruitleſs. §. 142. 1557. † *Spondan.* A. D. 1557. *n.* 15.

§. 143. 1561. After this A. D. 1561. a little before the renewing of the Council of *Trent*, in *Pius* the Fourth's time, there was held a *Colloquy* at *Poissy* in *France*: the King and Queen of *France* being present thereat, and *fourteen Protestant* Divines selected for it with Safe-conduct: and here, after much disputing at large, *five* of a side were chosen, to see if they could compose differences.—*These assayed* (saith *Soave*, p. 454) *to frame an Article concerning the* Eucharist [the chief point of controversie] *in general terms taken out of the Fathers, which might give satisfaction to both parties; which because they could not do, they concluded the Colloquy.*

§. 144. In this year also, the *Princes* of the *Augustan* Confession in *Germany* (which Confessionists also were at variance among themselves) assembled at *Neumburg*, where,—*Being ashamed*, (saith *Soave*, p. 439) *that their Religion should be esteemed a confusion for the variety of doctrines amongst them, they did propose, that they might first agree in one; and then resolve, whether they ought to refuse, or accept, the Synod* [that under *Pius* 4. now ready to be opened.] And here, after some things had been proposed for a *covering* at least of their differences, which could not be closed (for though here they had sole Scripture for their Rule, and themselves for their Judges, yet it seems they could not agree them.)—*The Duke of* Saxony (saith the same Author) *answered; that they could not stop the eyes and ears of the world, that they should not see and hear their differences; and that, if they would make shew of union, where they were at variance, they should be convinced of vanity and lying: and so* (saith *Soave*) *after many contentions, they remained without agreement in this matter.*

§. 145. These Diets and Colloquies about settling Religion, I have been the more willing particularly to relate; *partly, to remove that conceit of many; that, if the Protestant-Divines had but had a *fair hearing* of their cause in the Council of *Trent*, a major part would have consented to them: whereas we see many a free, and fair, hearing of them here, was, in so many *Conferences*; and yet none of their Antagonists of the Catholick party removed thereby from their former principles. * And partly to shew you, what is most likely to have been the issue of such a General Council, as the Protestants called for; *i. e.* where an equal number, chosen on both sides (suppose Lay-persons) should have sitten the *Presidents*, and *Judges*; and to make appear, that, if once we take away the authority of *Councils*, as constituted, and composed in the manner alwaies formerly used, there is no hope of settling Divinity-controversies by Arbitrators. For men will submit to nothing against their private, reasons, or judgment; *i. e.* a-

gainst

gainſt their Conſcience, as many call it; unleſs it be, when ſuch perſons have detided ſuch a point, whoſe authority they are obliged, in conſcience, to obey.

§. 146. This is ſaid to the *Conditions* of a General Council which the Proteſtants of thoſe times demanded. But, if thoſe conditions only were required, which Archbiſhop *Laud* mentions, §. 30. (though, §. 27. he ſeems to exact much more,) who there ſaith —*That any General Council ſhall ſatisfie him, that is lawfully called, continued, and ended, according to the ſame courſe, and under the ſame conditions, which General Councils obſerved in the primitive Church.* Where he refers, in the margent, to *Bellarmins* four Conditions, —*de Concil. l.* 1. *c.* 17. [namely,—1. *Ut Evocatio ſit generalis, ita ut innoteſcat omnibus majoribus Chriſtianis provinciis.* 2. *Ut ex epiſcopis non excommunicatis nullus excludatur.* 3. *Ut adſint, per ſe, vel per alios, quatuor precipui Patriarchæ præter ſummum Pontificem, quia iſtis ſubſunt omnes alii Epiſcopi* (but to this *Bellarmin* adds ſome limitations) 4. *Ut ſaltem ex majori parte Chriſtianarum Provinciarum aliqui adveniant.*] then, I ſay, as theſe conditions are moſt reaſonable, ſo, I think, they have been already ſhewed to agree to the Council of *Trent*; excepting the third; of the diſpenſableneſs of which, in ſeveral caſes, ſee both what *Bellarmin* there ſaith; and what is ſaid above, §. 65. 66.; Neither, if men would be content, with Biſhop *Bramhal* (in *prefac.* to *Repl.* to *Chalc.*) to ſubmit themſelves to ſo General a Council, as can be procured, as things now are, can there be any debate about this *Condition.*

CHAP. IX.

III. Head. *Of the Legalneſs of the proceedings of this Council.*

1. *That a Council may be Legal, and Obligatory, in ſome of its Acts, when not in others,* §. 147.
2. *That no Decree concerning Faith was paſſed in this Council, where any conſiderable party contradicted,* §. 148.
3. *That there was no need of uſing any violence upon the Council for the condemning of the Proteſtant-Opinions; in condemning which, the Fathers of this Council unanimouſly agreed,* §. 150.

4. *That no violence was uſed upon the Council, for defining of Points debated between the Catholicks themſelves,* §. 152.

Where,

Of the Councils proceedings, touching the chief points in debate.

Touching, 1. *Epiſcopal Reſidency,* Jure Divino, §. 153.

2. *Epiſcopal Juriſdiction,* Jure Divino, §. 154.

3. *The Popes Superiority to Councils,* §. 155.

That theſe three Points of Controverſies, however ſtated, are of no great advantage to the Reformed, §. 156.

5. *That no violence was uſed upon the Council, for hindring any juſt Reformations.* §. 157.

---

§. 147. THus much from (§. 127) of the ſecond Head propoſed; the *Conditions* of a General Council, which the *Proteſtants* required. Now let us conſider the third, *concerning the legal proceedings of the Council of* Trent.

1. Where firſt, you muſt remember: That a *Council* proved *illegal*, or not *free*, in ſome of its proceedings, cannot therefore juſtly be rejected in all other its acts whatſoever; but only in thoſe, that are firſt proved to be *illegal*, and *not free*, and to be reputed as ſuch, or at leaſt not *accepted* as the contrary, by that Eccleſiaſtical Authority, which legally concludes the *whole*. For, the ſame Council may become obligatory in ſome of its Acts, when not in others, as thoſe ſhall conſent to ſome Act, diſſent from others, without whoſe acceptance none are ratified. And ſo it was in the fourth General Council of *Chalcedon*; Whoſe Decrees, though for other matters, confirm'd; yet its 27th Canon, in the preference of the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, before the 2d, Patriatch of *Alexandria*, being diſallowed by the *Roman*, and the other *Weſtern* Biſhops, doubtleſs, hence, was of no force, till afterward this was alſo by them conſented to. Neither, if we can ſhew in ſome Council, that the *Prime Patriarch*, preſiding in it, or the *major* part of Church-Governours (who were abſent) have rejected ſome particular Canons thereof, can we, here, plead our ſelves free from obedience for all the reſt (ſee ſuch arguing in Dr *Hammond*, of Hereſie, §. 9. *n.* 6. and §. 11. *n.* 3, 7.) which both he, and the major part of the Church, have allowed, and conform to. For thus, the Eutychian might plead his freedom from any obligation to thoſe Canons of *Chalcedon* that were *univerſally* agreed on by Eaſt and Weſt, becauſe the 27th. Canon forementioned, touching another matter, was refuſed to be ratified by the Pope, and Weſtern Biſhops. Or *Dioſcorus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*,

Alexandria, there condemned, might justly plead: That, because, without the consent of the Bishop of *Rome*, and all those of the West, the Constitutions of the *second Ephesin* Council were of no force, therefore neither those of *Chalcedon* were so, without his. Or, an ordinary Bishop, in a Provincial Council, might plead; that, because, the *Metropolitan*, by the Canon, exerciseth a negative power and voice, for matters voted therein, therefore *he* also, where he thinks fit, will use, and claim the like. Neither will the Illegalness, or non-freedom of any Conciliary Act, pretended by a few, signifie any thing, when the contrary is declared, or such Act is accepted, by so *great* and *dignified* a part of the Church besides, as doth lawfully conclude the *whole*. For, suppose whatever *irregularity* in the making of such a Decree, yet this *Acceptation* and acknowledgment clears it of such former blemish, and gives it a just force.

§. 148. 2. 2ly. Observe, what *Soave* confesseth, p. 576. —*That it was a general maxim in this Council; that, to establish a Decree of Reformation, a major part of voices was sufficient; but, that a Decree of Faith could not be made, if a considerable part did contradict.* Where also he saith, — * *That, because hardly more than half of the Fathers would consent, that the allowance of the Cup should be referred to the Pope's pleasure* [namely, those Fathers refusing this reference, who thought it not fit to be allowed at all] *therefore the Legats made it one of the Articles of Reformation,* — *and* * *that some said, that the point, that Christ offered himself in the supper, was not lawfully decided, because it had 23 contradictors*: [But, *Pallav.* (*l.* 18. *c.* 9. *n.* 9.) shews, *Soave* to be mistaken in this instance, this point having had only two contradictors, as appears in the acts of the Council.] And observe again, what *Soave* very often inculcateth; That it was the Custom in in this Council, to mould and change the Articles, and matter of their Decrees, till there was nothing contained in them, that displeased any considerable party. So he saith, p. 215. *That S.* Croce *the Legat, took incredible pains, in avoiding to insert any thing in the Decrees, controverted among the Schoolmen; and in so handling those, which could not be omitted, as that every one might be contented; In every congregation observed what was disliked by any, and took it away, or corrected it, as he was advised.* Now what is this, but to say: that all, or almost all, were pleased with whatever was passed or voted, since he saith, that whatever displeased, was taken away; and that the *Proponents* did not force the Council to their propositions, but fitted their propositions to the mind of the Council: and then I ask, what

what violence or indirect means needed here to be uſed, to overbear a party?

§ 149. To this uſual conduct of the Council, all the exception that that can be taken is; that thus, it hath left *many* controverſies *undecided*. To which may be replied, 1. That, if the Proteſtant may Judge, the Councils greateſt fault was in making ſo many deciſions; not, in making no more: and ſee *Soave* elſewhere cenſuring the Council on this ſide, p. 227. and 228. where he makes ſome to ſay,—*That in all the Councils held in the Church from the Apoſtles time till then, there were never ſo many Articles decided, as in one Seſſion only of* Trent [*viz.* the ſixth *Seſſion.*] And p. 822.—*that in this Council matters were minced; and an article of faith made of every queſtion which could be moved in any matter,* (yet (*Ibid*) are the ſame people angry; That in Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Indulgences, the Council was not more particular in her deciſions. Defining, or not defining, how ſhall the Council pleaſe him, or his counterfeit German *Chorus?*) 2. That nothing more than this ſhewed the great wiſdom of the Council; which forbare ſuch *deciſions*, either when it eſteemed the controverſie ſubtile, nice, inconſiderable, and *needleſs* to be determined; or, very *difficult*, and doubtful, and not having ſufficient evidence from Scriptures, and former Tradition, to be determined: The Council for the things it ſtates depending more on *Church Hiſtory*, than *Logick*. Nor hence may any, when the Council thought fit to expreſs ſomething only in *general* terms, juſtly charge the Council with *ambiguity*, or equivocation, becauſe it anſwers not in its decree to every queſtion propoſed; but rather commend it for a judicious refuſal to decide ſuch matter more ſpecifically, for the reaſon mentioned above, that it might ſtand confirm'd with a more general Acceptation; whilſt, mean while, the more generical deciſion is not made in vain, theſe more univerſal terms deciding ſuch point againſt ſome other ſects of religion more grolly erring, when they do not decide it alſo for all parties of the Schools. And this, I think, may ſatisfie *Soave's* ſad complaints concerning the contradictings of *Soto* and *Vega*, p. 216.—and of *Soto* and *Catharinus*, p. 229. both perhaps faultily endeavouring to make the determination of the Council more *ſpecifical*, than it was, that ſo it might ſpeak on his ſide.

§. 150. 3. 3ly. Obſerve; that there can be no juſt exceptions taken againſt the free proceedings of the Council for thoſe matters of controverſie decided in it, wherein the *Proteſtants* oppoſed the Roman Church no violence or tyranny uſed, either by the Pope

over

over the Council, or by a more powerful party in the Council over the reſt, in theſe points. Which appears by the great *unanimity* and concord of the Tridentine Fathers, even according to *Soaves* relations, for that part of their *Decrees*, and Canons, wherein are condemned any of the *Proteſtant* tenents. To inſtance in ſome of the chief. See their unanimity, in what oppoſed the Proteſtants, *Concerning Original ſin. Soave*, p. 175.—*No man reſiſted the condemnation of the* [Proteſtant] *Articles*.—and, p. 184. *In the Council there being no more difference amongſt the Fathers, concerning the things diſcuſſed*, &c. *Concerning Juſtification* (excepting the moſt difficult Arminian, and Janſenian, controverſies) *Soave*, p. 223.—*The two next congregations* (ſaith he) *were ſpent in reading again the decrees as well of of faith. as of reformation: the which (ſome ſmall matters being corrected by the advice of thoſe, who were not preſent at the firſt) pleaſed them all. Concerning the neceſſity of confeſſion to the Prieſt* of mortal ſins committed after Baptiſm, See *Soave*, p. 348. where no oppoſition at all was made amongſt them, to the 6, 7, and 8, Canons of the 14th Seſſion. *Concerning Tranſubſtantiation and Adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt*, See *Soave*, p. 324. and 326. where in the ſecond and ſixth Canons of the 13 Seſſion none diſſented, and many deſired to have them more full and enlarged. *Concerning the Maſs, that it is a propitiatory ſacrifice*, There was no diſagreement neither amongſt the Divines, *Soave*, p. 544. nor amongſt the Prelats, p. 554. and 738. *Concerning the lawfulneſs, and ſufficiency, of communicating only in one kind*: and, that, under every kind, and every part of it ſeparated, all Chriſt is contained, See *Soave*, p. 324, 325.—*Upon the 8th* [*Article*] (ſaith he) *all made uſe of long diſcourſes, though all to the ſame purpoſe. Their principal reaſons to condemn it were*, &c.—*That as much is not contained under one ſpecies* [by concomitancy] *as under both, was thought to be heretical.* and p. 519.—*They all agreed, that there was no neceſſity, or precept, of the Cup.* Though, this was not ſo unanimouſly agreed upon, and therefore left undecided, whether ſome greater meaſure of grace was not received by communicating in both, than in one, kind. See *Pall. l.* 12. *c.* 2.—and *l.* 17. *c.* 7. *n.* 10. Again, *Concerning the permiſſion of the uſe of the Cup*, when as the Pope and his Legats, upon the earneſt ſollicitation of the Emperour, and many other Princes, were all inclined to a diſcreet indulging thereof, yet the major part of the Council went againſt them for the negative. See *Soave*, p. 459, 519, 567. And chiefly the Biſhops of thoſe Countries, where were no Proteſtants, becauſe all the Council having agreed, that the *cup* was not neceſſary, all *Chriſt* being

ing in both the kinds, they imagined, that diverſities of rites in ſeveral Nations, eſpecially in the moſt principal ceremonies, would ~~which~~ end in ſchiſme and hatred (*Soave*, p. 459.) And with much ado was it procured at laſt, that the judgment of this *permiſsion* ſhould be remitted to the Pope; but this, without any *recommendation* to him at all (though by ſome deſired) of ſuch a permiſſion; and this remitting it to the *Pope* not conceded by all, or moſt, but only by ſo many, as made the major part: and therefore ſaith *Soave* (p. 576.) this conceſſion was put amongſt the Articles of Reformation. *Concerning the being of a Purgatory, the lawfulneſs of the Invocation of Saints, and veneration of Images.* Soave, p. 799. *In matter of Saints, they eaſily agreed to condemn particularly all the opinions contrary to the uſes of the Roman Church*, and p. 803.—*The Legats held a congregation the next morning, in which the decrees of Purgatory and of the Saints, were read, and afterward the Reformation of Friars read, and all approved with very great brevity, and little contradiction.* See the ſame in *Pall. l.* 24. *c.* 5. *n.* 5. Concerning the Holy Scriptures, or the Divine ſervice not to be uſed in the vulgar tongue, I find nothing decreed in the Council, ſave only *concerning one part of the ſervice, the Maſs*: and of it only this.—*Viſum eſt Patribus, non expedire, ut vulgari paſsim linguâ Miſſa celebraretur. Quamobrem retento antiquo, & probato ritu,* &c and *Can.* 9.—*Si quis dixerit, linguâ tantum vulgari Miſſam celebrari debere,* &c. *Anathema ſit.* [where you may obſerve that *Soave* (I am afraid) to make theſe decrees of the Council the more odious; or to have ſomething more to ſay againſt them, in relating the *one* Canon, leaves out *paſsim*: and in the other leaves out *tantum*, p. 573, 574.] And to theſe all unanimouſly conſented (Ibid.) *The Fathers* (ſaith he) *aſſented to the decrees; except only to that particular, that Chriſt did offer himſelf. Concerning Prieſts non-marriage, and the univerſal capability of the gift of chaſtity, and lawfulneſs of the vow of continency*, the 9th Canon of the 24th Seſſion, the words of which are theſe *Si quis dixerit, Clericos in ſacris ordinibus conſtitutos, vel Regulares, caſtitatem ſolemniter profeſſos, poſſe matrimonium contrahere, contractumq; validum eſſe, non obſtante lege Eccleſiaſtica vel voto;—poſſeq; omnes contrahere matrimonium, qui non ſentiunt ſe caſtitatis, etiamſi eam voverint, habere donum, Anathema ſit; cum Deus id recte petentibus non deneget, nec patiatur nos ſupra id quod poſſumus tentari.*] This Canon, I ſay, was generally aſſented to by all the Council. See Soave, p. 783. *The doctrince and the anathematiſmes of Matrimony were read, to which all conſented*, and p. 747.—*The Article of the promotion of of married perſons to Holy Orders being propoſed, the Fathers did uniformly,*

uniformly, and without difficulty, agree on the negative. See likewise, p. 678, 679. *Concerning Episcopacy*: Any thing therein oppoſit to *Lutheraniſme*, as the *Superiority* of Biſhops *to Prieſts*, &c *Seſſ.* 23. *c.* 7. was unanimouſly defined. See *Soave*, p. 599 and 738.

Thus, you ſee, I have run through the chief differences; to add more is eaſie, but needleſs; giving you in the cloſe the general obſervation of *Soave*, p. 230. *That, which hath been related* (ſaith he) *in this particular* [the Controverſie concerning the certainty of Grace] *and perhaps did happen in many matters* [*i. e.* the members of the Council to differ in their judgment] *occurred not in condemning the Lutheran opinions; where all did agree with an exquiſit unity.* To which words may be added what Archbiſhop *Lawd* confeſſeth, §. 27. *n.* 1. — *That none had ſuffrage in the Council, but ſuch as were profeſſed enemies to all, that called for reformation.* Therefore no Biſhops, that were preſent in that Council (for all ſuch had ſuffrages) but were enemies to all, that called for reformation. And, this being ſo, ſurely there needed to be uſed no *tyranny* over ſuch perſons for ſo much as concerned the *Proteſtant* controverſies. What will be ſaid here, I know not. ſhall we pretend, that this unanimity of the Council againſt the Lutheran tenents, roſe out of ignorance of the grounds of their doctrine? But they read their works, and diligently collected out of theſe what doctrines were fit to be condemned; which they could not do, without ſeeing alſo in them the *reaſons* and *foundations* of ſuch doctrines. Or aroſe it out of fear, which ſome of the Council, well inclined, had of the reſt? The Archbiſhop (§. 29. *n.* 4.) ſeems to ſay ſome ſuch thing. — *For ought A. C. knows, many might agree with the Proteſtants in heart, that in ſuch a Council durſt not open themſelves.* But ſo, in the Council of *Nice*, for ought we know, many might agree with the Arrians. How can we have any judgment or ſentence from Councils, if we appeale from their mouths to their hearts, inſcrutable by us? But, if the Archbiſhops *many* were an inconſiderable part of the Council, then ſtill it is confeſt, that the main body of the Council were againſt the Proteſtants; which we were here to demonſtrate: If his *many* were a great and conſiderable part of the Council, ſo as the act of the reſt without them would have been invalid, then why they ſhould ſo fear, as not to open their mouth, I ſee not. Or laſtly aroſe it out of that *fear*, which all the *Council* had of the *Pope*? But then why did they, in matters which more nearly concerned the Pope, ſo freely vote againſt what he, and what his Legats approved, even ſome of the Italians with the reſt? || For if there

§. 151. *n.* 1.

|| See below were §. 153, 168.

were twice ſo many Italians as others, a major part of the Council could not vote againſt the Popes inclinations, without ſome of the Italian Biſhops concurring.

§. 151. n. 2. But to diſpel clearly theſe doubts, you may underſtand, that the Biſhops voted nothing againſt the Proteſtants, in the chief points at leaſt, but what was their own *belief* and *practice* before they came to the Council; and what had been the practiſe and belief of many former ages, even the reformed being Judges: And that the chief *queſtion* to be decided in the Council, was; whether ſuch, and ſuch practices *lawful*, *viz.* whether *Communion in one kind only*: *Adoration of Chriſts corporal Preſence in the Euchariſt*; *offering the ſacrifice of the Maſs*; *veneration of Images*; *Prayer to Saints*; *Prayer for the Dead, as better able, thereby, in their preſent condition before the day of Judgment*; *Indulgences*; *Monaſtick Vows*; *enjoyning Celibacy*; *enjoyning Sacerdotal Confeſſion, in caſe of mortal ſin*, &c. be *lawful*. And, ſeeing the chief queſtion, in oppoſition to the new Lutheran Doctrines, was; whether theſe things lawful, which were then, and in many former generations (Proteſtants not denying it) daily practiſed, what need, of force, of new Mandats from *Rome*, of hiring Suffrages, creating more titular Biſhops, Oaths of ſtrict obedience to the Pope, ſuch a multitude of Italians, to procure a prevalent vote, or, to invite the Prelats in the *Council* to eſtabliſh thoſe things, ſeveral of which are found in their *Miſſals* and *Breviaries*. As: *the Sacrifice of the Maſs*; *Adoration of Chriſts Body and Blood in the Euchariſt*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Prayer for the Dead*.] But yet, if theſe *Fathers* of the *Council* decided theſe things in ſuch a manner, by compulſion, how came both the Catholick Biſhops, in the German *Diets*, where free from ſuch *fears*, or *force*, in the time of the Council, to vote the ſame things, and alſo after the Council the many more *abſent* Fathers of the Weſtern Churches (and of *France* with the reſt) ſo freely, and voluntarily, to *accept* them, and to continue till their death in the conſtant obſervance of them.

But if it be ſaid, that, though ſuch things were generally believ'd, and practiſed before, yet, by Art and violence, were now the Fathers brought to advance them into matters of *Faith*; I ask, concerning many of theſe Points, what *Faith* required, ſave of thoſe Truths, which are neceſſary to render them lawful, beneficial, &c. All practice lawful being grounded on ſome ſpeculative Propoſition, that muſt be true. Or, if more be required: yet more than this, *viz.* the *lawfulneſs* of ſuch practiſes, wherein theſe Fathers voluntarily concurr'd, was no way neceſſary for overthrowing the *Proteſtants* contrary *Doctrine*.

47. Obſerve

4ly. Obſerve that no *violence* was uſed upon the Council for other points debated between the *Catholicks* themſelves; *no violence*, ſo far, as that any thing favourable or advantageous to the Pope was at any time paſſed in the Council, when any ſmall number thereof oppoſed it, Concerning which *Pallavicino* in the cloſe of his Hiſtory, *l.* 24 *c.* 14. *n.* 9 hath theſe words.—*There was not in this Council eſtabliſhed, one point of faith, nor one canon of diſcipline for the advantage of Popes; but, amongſt the ſecond* [the canons of diſcipline] *very many, to their detriment,—and of ſuch a thing indeed*, Soave *himſelf brings not ſo much as one example; ſo much is there wanting to him any ſign, or ſhadow thereof.* But, not to reſt in the teſtimony of a partiſan. The chief points agitated in the Council, wherein the Popes pre-eminence and priviledges are ſaid to be much concerned, were, beſides the matters of Reformation, theſe three—1. *Whether reſidency of Biſhops at their Biſhopricks, was* jure divino? which, if eſtabliſhed, it was conceived, that it would take away from the Pope the power of giving Diſpenſations, Adminiſtrations, and Commendams, Pluralities, *&c.* by which, amongſt other things, the Popes Attendents, and the dignity of his Court, would be much leſſened. See *Soave*, p. 647. 2. *Whether the Juriſdiction of Biſhops was* jure divino? which if eſtabliſhed, it was conceived, that it would infer, that the keys were not given to *Peter* only; that all Biſhops were equal to the Pope; and the Council above him, *&c.* ſee *Soave*, p. 609. 3. *Whether the Pope was ſuperior to Councils*; In never a one of which was any thing decreed on the Popes ſide. §. 152. 4 1. 2. 3.

1. Concerning *Reſidency* of *Biſhops*, it was not determined according to what was conceived to be the Popes inclination, *viz.* that Reſidency was not *jure divino*; but, that which was determined (being, *Seſſ.* 23. *de reform. cap.* 1.) ſeemed rather to favour *jure divino*; upon a jealouſie of which (*Pall. l.* 21. *c.* 12. *n.* 9. ſaith) ſome few excepted againſt the decree. Pope *Pius*, though he deſired the queſtion were omitted, yet ſhewed much moderation in it.—(*He did not condemn*, ſaith *Soave*, p. 503. *the opinion of thoſe who ſaid that Reſidency was* de jure divino, *yea he commended them for ſpeaking according to their conſcience; and ſometimes he added; that perhaps, that opinion was the better.*) and ordered, that the Council might have its free courſe in it. As you may ſee in *Pall. l.* 24. *c.* 14. *n.* 11. and *l.* 16. *c.* 7. *n.* 19. (where he quotes the French Embaſſadors teſtimony) and partly, in *Soave*, p. 504, 505. where he ſaith,—*That the Pope having well diſcuſſed the reaſons* [concerning Reſidency] *ſettled his opinion to approve it, and cauſe it* §. 153. 1.

executed, upon what law ſoever it were grounded, whether Canonical, or evangelical. And 2. of his Legats were thought to favour
‖ *Pall. l.* 24. *c.* 14.—*Soave* p. 496, 623. the determining of it, *jure divino*: ‖ and when it was put to the vote; whether this controverſie ſhould be ſtated by the Council, or no; a major part were for the *affirmative* (*Soave*, p. 496) which, being ſuppoſed contrary to the Popes deſire, ſhews, that, amongſt the reſt, ſome Italians alſo (who made the greater part of the Council) took liberty to relinquiſh his intereſt. Though, in fine, this point [whether *Jure divino*] was left undecided, becauſe taking in thoſe, who referred to the Pope, almoſt an equal
‖ *l.* 16. *c.* 4. *n.* 21. part (as *Soave*; but *Pallavi.* ‖ correcting him, ſaith, a major part) drew the contrary way; and to what elſe was ſtated about reſidence (*Seſſ.* 23. *Refor. cap.* 1.) in the Seſſion all agreed, ſave only eleven. See *Pall. l.* 21. *c* 12. *n.* 9.—and *Soave*, p. 742. And, in the General Congregation held before the Seſſion, all, ſave 28.
† p. 737—& *Pallav. l* 21. *c.* 11. *n.* 4. §. 154. 2. ſaith *Soave*, † *i. e.* ſome of the Spaniſh Biſhops.

2. Concerning *Epiſcopacy*, *jure Divino* [of which the 6. *Can. de Sacram. Ordinis*, *Seſſ.* 23. ſpeaks thus.—*Si Quis dixerit, in Eccleſiâ Catholicâ non eſſe Hierarchiam divinâ ordinatione inſtitutam, quæ conſtat ex Epiſcopis, Presbyteris, & Miniſtris, Anathema ſit*; where the Spaniſh Biſhops would have had, *Divinâ Ordinatione*, changed into *per inſtitutionem Chriſti.*] The great diſpute in the Council was not whether the *Order* of Biſhops, as ſuperior to *Prieſts*, and as including the power of *ordination* and *confirmation*, but whether the Juriſdiction of all Biſhops, eſpecially as to ſome points thereof, was *jure divino*, [*viz.* as to the *juſt extent*, and ſubject matter, of ſuch Juriſdiction, and the exterior and *forenſick* exerciſe thereof, wherein ſome Biſhops enjoy a much larger power, and compaſs, which extent of power ſeems to depend on *ſuperiors* (as doth alſo the exerciſe of *Abſolution* in *Prieſts*) and is liable to be ſuſpended, taken away, tranſferr'd, diminiſhed: and this neceſſary, for avoiding confuſion. †] And here, as nothing was de-
† See *Soave*, p. 623, 734. termined *againſt* the Pope, in this matter, ſo nothing *for* him. And, that no more in it ſhould be decided, than was decided, all the Council conſented in the Seſſion; and in the Congregation, held before it, all ſave the Spaniſh Biſhops, and therefore more conſented to this, than only the Italians, and the Popes party: ſee what *Soave* ſaith, p. 737, 738, 725, 735. where he relates,—*That the Cardinal of* Lorraine, *and the other French Prelats did not hold the Juriſdiction and Superiority of Biſhops, de jure divino, to be neceſſary to be mained in Council, but rather that it ought to be omitted.* Now the Pope (if he had a major part of the Council on his ſide) hinder the reſt for carrying any thing againſt him, by their

their votes, yet could he not over-aw the reſt, thus, to vote for him, who having much more dependence, for their Eſtates, on their Temporal, than their Spiritual, Supream, and backed by their Princes, and their Embaſſadours, in the Council (theſe alſo generally much more favouring the *Biſhops* than the *Popes*, rights) were ſecure enough againſt his power; even the Italian Prelats alſo, except that much ſmaller part of them, whoſe preferments lay in the Popes Dominions.

§. 155. 3.

3. Concerning the *Popes Supremacy* in the Church, or *Superiority* to *Councils*, though the Spaniards, and all the reſt of the Council conſented, in as full terms, as the Council of *Florence* had expreſſed it, to decree, and inſert, it in this Council alſo; and though only the *French Biſhops*, who were not above the tenth part of the Council, reſiſted, yet the Pope, for peace ſake, becauſe there was not a full accord, ceaſed to proſecute the determination thereof; and the Article, drawn, was laid aſide. See theſe things more fully related in *Pallavic.* Hiſtory, *l.* 19. and *l.* 24. *c.* 14. *n.* 12. and ſee there † the contents of *Carlo Borrhomeo's* Letters to this purpoſe. But the ſame thing, of the *Spaniſh* conſenting with the *Italians*, for declaring the Popes *authority* according to the *form* of the Council of *Florence*, appears in *Soave*, p. 737, 738. (though he much more compendious than *Pallavicin* in this part of the Hiſtory, perhaps for want of intelligence; of which he complains in the beginning of his ſeventh book, p. 583) And the ſame Author ſaith elſewhere, p. 732.—*That an order came from the Emperour to his Embaſſadors, to uſe all means, that the authority of the Pope ſhould not be diſcuſſed in Council, becauſe he ſaw the major part was inclin'd to enlarge it.* Yet, we ſee, the Pope did not proſecute ſuch advantage. Neither doth that phraſe accidentally uſed in *Seſſ.* 25. *Reform.* 1. cap.—[*Sed & ad S. Romanæ Eccleſiæ Cardinales pertinere decernit, quorum conſilio apud Sanctum Romanum Pontificem cum univerſalis Eccleſiæ adminiſtratio nitatur*, &c. which the French Embaſſador *Ferrieres* ſo highly aggravated, that it yielded to the Pope ſuperiority over Councils †] truly prove any ſuch thing; neither paſſed it from the Council as any *Decree*; neither, in the reading (in the Congregation) of this, 1 *cap.* of *Reform.* wherein were ſome things corrected, did the *French Biſhops* except at this, † which certainly they would have done, had they apprehended ſuch danger in it. For alſo the French were not ſuch oppoſites to the Popes pre-eminency of authority, but that their Leader, the Cardinal of *Lorraine* propoſed in the Council this Article for it (*Pallav. l.* 19. *c.* 6.) condemning any that ſhould ſay;—*That* Peter, *by the inſtitution of Chriſt, was not the Prime amongſt*

† *l.* 19. *c.* 15. *n.* 3.

† *Sorve* p. 818.

† *Soave* p. 803.

amongſt the Apoſtles, and his ſupreme Vicar. — *Or that it was not neceſſary, that there ſhould be in the Church a chief Biſhop.* Peters *Succeſſor, and equal to him, in the authority of Government,* — *and that his lawful Succeſſors in the See of* Rome *have not the right of Primacy in the Church.* And the French Biſhops, though they diſallowed this form, — [*Datam eſſe à Concilio Pontifici Romano poteſtatem paſcendi, & regendi univerſalem*] becauſe *Eccleſia univerſalis* here, if taken *collectively*, would prejudice the French Churches opinion of the Councils ſuperiority to the Pope, † yet they yielded to this form, — [*poteſtatem regendi omnes fideles, & omnes Eccleſias*, — or, *paſcendi omnes Chriſti oves*,] if *omnes* be not taken *conjunctim*. And for that Supremacy of the Pope over the Church, that is denied by Proteſtants, *Soave*, giving reaſons, why *Henry* the 8th *prudently* declined a Council, thus ſecures this Supremacy Papal from any cenſure of the Biſhops, ſaying, ‡ — *That it was impoſſible, that a Council, compoſed of Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, ſhould not maintain this his power, which is the main pillar of their Order: Becauſe this Order* (ſaith he) *by the Papacy, is above all Kings, and the Emperour: but, without it, is ſubject to them, there being no Eccleſiaſtical Perſon that hath ſuperiority, but the Pope.* Thus he, uſually extracting the Original of all mens actions not out of Conſcience, but Policy. Yet in theſe points we ſee the Popes ſuppoſed major party in the Council carried nothing for his advantage. But, how much the former bounds of the Epiſcopal Authority were *enlarged* by ſeveral Decrees of this Council that were confirmed, and ratified by the Pope, wherein at leaſt they are ſubſtituted his perpetual and ſtanding *Delegats* for tranſacting many things of great conſequence, formerly diſpatched by Himſelf, and his Officers, See below, 205, 211. *&c.*

† Pall. l. 19. c. 13. n. 6. — c. 12. n. 11. — l. 28. c. 14. n. 12. *Soave*, p. 657.

‡ §. 150. p. 70.

Mean while, whether, or how much the Pope, or his party, when ſtronger there, might be faulty, in *hindering* any points to be determined, which the reſt of the Fathers in the Council deſired ſhould be ſo, I cannot ſay; becauſe I cannot judge, whether ſuch things are neceſſary to be determined, as ſome of the Council ſaid they were, a few: or better not, as others, the moſt. But, if the Pope be culpable, for having (abſtracting here from Proteſtant-Controverſies, as hath been ſhewed †) hindred by his Italian adherents ſomething, that otherwiſe would have *paſſed*, He ſeems to make an amends for it, in the not *paſſing* in Council ſeveral other matters, which would have ſerved much for his advantage, when but a few ſeem'd diſcontented therewith.

§. 150

But

But, in the next place, let us now ſuppoſe, that, the Council un-oppreſſed, the contrary party there had carried all theſe points againſt the Pope, there could have followed, that I diſcern, no ſuch great advantage to *Proteſtantiſme* thereby, as ſome boaſt of. You may ſee the *conſequences*, endamaging the Pope, ſet down by *Soave*, p. 609, 645. ſome of which are of no great moment, and others not truly conſequent. Certainly the Biſhops, who contended for their Juriſdiction, *jure divino*, intended no ſuch thing, as to equal, every one himſelf with the Pope in the Government of the Church; or to overthrow thereby, * the former Church-diſcipline; * the pre-eminent authority of *Primats*, and *Patriarchs*, conceded by former Councils; and * all the *jus Eccleſiaſticum*. This may be ſeen in their argumentations; wherein ſome pleaded a Juriſdiction belonging to all Biſhops, *jure divino*, and received immediatly from Chriſt, but this not *equal* with the Popes; others, their Juriſdiction received *jure divino*, but the *uſe*, application, and matter thereof received from the Pope (*Soave*, *p.* 597. 607. 618. 637.—*Pall. l.* 19. *c.* 6. *n.* 3.) The French allowing from Chriſt the Popes ſuperiority, as was ſhewed but now; † only confining his authority within the Canons (*Soave*, *p.* 640.) and the Spaniards, who moſt ſtickled for Epiſcopal Jurisdiction, *jure divino*, yet willingly conceding to the Pope all the power, that was acknowledged by the Council of *Florence*, and deſiring that both theſe might be eſtabliſhed together, as hath been ſhewed above; inſomuch, as *Pall. l.* 19. *c.* 6. *n.* 6. ſaith,—*It ſeemed to ſome, that the contention was reduced to meer words; whilſt the one would have the Juriſdiction of Biſhops to be immediatly from the Pope; the others, from Chriſt; yet ſo that the uſe and matter of ſuch Juriſdiction depended on the Pope.* And therefore I ſee no weight in thoſe words of *B. Bramh.* (*Schiſ. guarded*, 10. *Sect. p.* 474.) who to *S. Ws.* asking, whether, if the Catholick Biſhops out of their Provinces had been preſent in the Council to counterpoiſe the Italians, he would pretend, that they would have voted againſt their Fellow-Catholicks in behalf of *Luther*, and *Calvin*, anſwereth thus,—*I ſee clearly, that if the Biſhops of other Countreys had been proportioned to thoſe of* Italy, *they had carried the debate about Reſidence* [yet is not Reſidence even amongſt Proteſtants voted, *jure divino.*] *the divine Right of Epiſcopacy; and that had done the buſineſs of the Weſtern Church, and undone the Court of* Rome. *Done the buſineſs of the Weſtern Church?* what meaneth he? So, as the Pope would have ceaſed to have had any Supremacy over them? why, thoſe alſo allow and ſubmit to it, who ſtill hold Epiſcopal Juriſdiction, *jure divino*; as none in the Roman Church are obliged

§. 156.

† §. 156.

to

to hold the contrary. But ſuppoſe the Pope diſarmed of Supremacy, are thus all the other *main differences* in points of faith, between Proteſtants, and theſe Weſtern Biſhops, ſtated on the *Proteſtant* ſide? Or will the Reformed now declare them controverſies of ſmall moment (as Biſhop *Bramh.* in a vehement aſſaulting of the Court of *Rome*, ſeems to relax other quarrels with that Church) and yield them to their Adverſaries? But had any the art firſt to accord theſe ſpeculative points of difference, which the Proteſtants have with the Weſtern Churches, he need not fear, that the Popes *ſupremacy* could put any bar between the two Religions. Which *ſupremacy* thoſe Catholick Biſhops, or Churches, that do moſt abridge, and have their free liberty to maintain, what in the Council they would have voted, concerning this matter, do yet continue in the other points as violent, and ſtiff, againſt the reformed, as any.

§. 157. 5. 5. Thus much of the Popes, and Councils proceedings in thoſe three great points of contention. Next, concerning the Popes carriage toward the Council for other matters of *Reformation*, wherein he is ſo much accuſed to have made unjuſt obſtructions. *Pallavicino*, in vindication of *Pius* the 4th. in whoſe times theſe Reformations were moſt agitated, and proceeded in, hath theſe words (*l.* 24. *c.* 12, *n.* 13.) — *Pius the 4th frequently enjoyned his Legats, that a Reformation ſhould be made of his Court, and of his Tribunals* [and eſpecially of the Cardinals, which reformation he attempting firſt at *Rome* in vain, remitted it the more earneſtly to the Council, as may be ſeen in C. *Borrom.* letters. *Pall. l.* 22. *c.* 1. *n.* 5. — *l.* 21. *c.* 6. *n.* 6, 7.] *without any acquainting him firſt with it; frequently grieved and complained that it was not done; commended whatever was determined in the Seſſions concerning it, though unlooked for, contrary to his expectation, and moſt damageful to his treaſury, and to his Court.* Which words of his are verified, both by the frequent Letters to this purpoſe written to the Council by *Carlo Borrhomeo*, according to the Popes order, † which you may read at your leaſure: and by the teſtimony of *Lorraine*, and others, in the Council. And indeed how could this be otherwiſe? ſince *Carlo Borromeo*, that holy man, was his chief Adviſer, and chief *Miniſter*, to the Council in this, and all other affairs, who was himſelf one of the ſevereſt *Reformers* (yet not beſides the *Canons*) that ever the Church of Chriſt hath known, as the hiſtory of his life, written by *Giuſſano*, ſheweth.

† Apud *Pallav. l.* 20. *c.* 5. *n.* 5. — *l.* 21. *c.* 6. *n.* 1, 2, 6, 7. - *l.* 22. *c.* 1, *n.* 5, 12, 13.

§ 158. And, that actually, by this Council, a great and ſevere reformation was decreed, the Court of *Rome* much rectified, the Popes Revenue much diminiſhed, the *Juriſdiction* of Biſhops (whether

her held *immediatly*, or *mediatly*, from Christ, here it matters *not*) much enlarged, *Residency* of Bishops (whether it be *jure divino*, or *Ecclesiastico*) strictly enjoyned, former dispensations and appeals much restrained, I refer you to what the *Articles* themselves especially in the five last *Sessions* under *Pius*, make appear; and to what is said below in the five Head † concerning them; and §. 207. &c.
* to the testimony of the *French Bishops*, set down above, §. 77. with whom it was a chief motive, to request of the King the accepting this Council, because the French Church stood in so much need of the *reformations established therein*; *than which* (say they) *they could find none more austere and rigorous; nor more proper for the present malady, and indisposition of all the members of the body Ecclesiastical*: and * to the testimony of *Soave* himself recited above, §. 124. and below, §. 204. touching the heavy complaint of the Roman Court, concerning this *reformation*, and their endeavours with the Pope to hinder, for this cause, the *confirmation* of the *Council*. If its laws are not, since, every where so well observed, I desire that the Council, or the then Pope may not be indicted for this fault. Neither are we (for trying the benefit of that Council) so much to examine, whether there be not still some distempers left unprovided therein of a cure; as, whether *many*, which were before, are not remedied thereby; and whether the times preceding this Council were not much *more* depraved, than the present. Which I think you will not doubt of, if you read, both in the narrations of Catholicks and Protestants, the gross *corruptions* of those dayes. So that I may say, the unhappy reformation from that Church occasioned a happy one in it; and a schisme, by divine providence bringing good out of evil, served much to purifie the Catholick Religion. But of this Reformation, as to the particulars, I shall speak more fully in the fifth Head, §. 203. &c.

CHAP. X.

6. That no violence was inferred upon the liberty of the Council, as to the defining any thing therein contrary to the General Approbation,
By,

1. The Popes Legats proposing the things to be handled there, §. 160.

2. The Consultation made, in every thing, with the Pope, §. 164.

3. *The exceſſive number of Italian Biſhops*, §. 167. *And the not voting by Nations, but the preſent Prelats*, §. 169.
4. *The Popes giving Penſions*, §. 170.
5. *And admitting Titular Biſhops*, §. 171.
6. *The Prohibition of Biſhops Proxies to give Definitive votes* §. 172.

§. 159. 6. NEither ſeem thoſe things, which are ſo frequently objected, * to infer any violence, or make any treſpaſs, as they were uſed, upon the liberty of the Council, as to the defining any thing therein contrary to its general Approbation; or, * to be, in themſelves, unjuſt ſyable. Namely theſe; 1. The *Popes Legats propoſing* in publick the things to be handled in the Council. 2. Their *conſulting* in all matters, and receiving directions from, the *Biſhop of Rome*, and his entertaining alſo a *Council* at *Rome* to adviſe with. 3. The preſence in the Council of ſuch a *multitude* of *Italian* Biſhops; and the voting there not according to the plurality of Nations, but of their Repreſentatives preſent in the Council. 4. The Popes giving monthly *penſions* to ſeveral Biſhops. 5. Admitting *titular* ones in the Council. 6. The prohibition of Biſhops *proxies* to give *definitive* votes.

To 1. §. 160. To the firſt: The Popes *Legats propoſing* the things to be handled there. 1. For the lawfulneſs, and neceſſity, of certain perſons to direct, what *things* ſhall be handled, what *order* in them obſerved, &c. in ſuch great Aſſemblies, I deſire you to read *Soave's* diſcourſe, *p.* 135. where ſpeaking of Councils, he goes on thus, — *After a certain time, paſſions of men and charity being mingled together, and there being a neceſſity to govern them with ſome order, the chiefeſt man, amongſt thoſe that were aſſembled in the Council, either for learning, or for greatneſs of the City, or Church, whereof he was*, &c. *took upon him the charge to* propoſe, *and guide the action, and collect the voices.* — *After that it pleaſed God to give peace to Chriſtians*, &c. *the action was guided by thoſe Princes which did call them together; propoſing, and governing the treaty and decreeing, interlocutorily, the occurring differences; but leaving the deciſion of the principal point, for which the Council was congregated, to the common opinion of the aſſembly* [as alſo it cannot be denied the Legats did, themſelves giving their vote laſt. †] *This was done* * *in the firſt Council of* Epheſus *before the Earl* Candidianus *ſent Preſident by the Emperour; and more clearly* * *in that of* Chalcedon *before* Marcianus; *and the Judges by him appointed;* * *in that of* Conſtantinople

† Soave, p. 138.

Constantinople in Trullo, *before* Constantine Pogonatus; *where the Prince, or Magistrate that was President, commanded what should be handled, what order observed, who should speak, and who be silent* [so much not practised in the Council of Trent,] *and so did decide, and accommodate the differences in these things.* Yet closer, *p.* 330. ——*The judgment of the Church,* saith he (*as was necessary in every multitude*) *was fit, that it should be conducted by one, who should preside and guide the actions, propose the matters, and collect the points to be consulted on. This care, due to the most principal, and worthy person, was alwaies committed to the Bishop* [and then by consequence in a multitude of Prelats, to the most Principal Bishop among them.] Thus *Soave.* In this matter therefore you see the same things were done in former Councils, as in *Trent*; and when this done by a Bishop, the doing justified; can the same practice, then, in both leave those Councils free, and render this inslaved?

§. 161.

2. After this of *Soave*, see the Popes defence, in his Letters written to the Emperour, and King of *Spain*, upon their complaint of it, (*Apud Pallav. l.* 20. *c.* 8, *n.* 4.—and *c.* 10. *n.* 17. ——*That the words* [proponentibus Legatis] *were composed by the Synod it self without his knowledge; approved first unanimously in a general congregation; and afterward in the first Session* † [*i. e.* under *Pius*, which is the 17.th Session of the Council] *with the opposition of two only* [*Soave* saith of four; two more desiring a qualification of it.] *That, since Princes desired the Councils freedom from this, he was content it should be so: though he well foresaw the unbridled licentiousness that would come thereof.* See the Legats defence likewise, in answer to the King of *Spain*: *Pall. l.* 16. *c.* 6. *n.* 5.—and *Pallavicino's*, in answer to *Soave*—*l.* 23. *c.* 12. *n.* 7. Lastly, if you desire more satisfaction, see the unanimous explication of this clause, *proponentibus legatis*, both by the Legats, and Council (importun'd thereto by the King of *Spains* Letters, to whom the Proposals of *Princes* to the Council, as well as of other *Prelats* in it, seemed by this clause to receive some obstruction) *Sess.* 24. *c.* 21. *de Reform.* ——*S. Synodum explicando declarare, mentis suæ non fuisse, ut in præductis verbis solita ratio tractandi negocia in Generalibus Conciliis ullâ ex parte immutaretur; neq; novi quidquam, præter id, quod sacris canonibus, vel generalium Synodorum formâ hactenus statutum est, cuiquam adderetur, vel detraheretur.* By which Declaration (saith *Soave* †) that difficulty, so much agitated, received an end, with satisfaction of all. And a Comment on this Decree may be the free practise of the Fathers of this Council, and also of the Agents of Princes, not less after it, than before it.

† *Sess.* 17. *Decret. de Celebrand. Conc.*

† *p.* 781.

§. 162. 3. Again. Though the *proposal* of matters to be considered in the Council were necessary for order-sake to be committed to the care, and super-intendence of some particular members; and of whom rather, than the *more dignified*? yet it may be observed, through *Soaves* whole relation of the actions of this Council; that no matter, whereof the proposal was desired, or prosecuted by the *major*, or a *considerable*, part of the Bishops (unless, perhaps, the Councils proceeding in the reformation of Secular Princes, the Articles whereof are set down in *Soave*, p. 760 which, though advanced by the Clergy, all the Embassadours, and Orators unanimously opposed †) was stopped by the Legats *power* (though I grant, several times diverted, or dissuaded, by their *advice*,) and that proposals also were not unusually made in the Council by others (if we may *believe* ‖ *Soave*) proposals both most contrary to the Popes interest, and most displeasing to his Legats. To name some: Such were, * those concerning the two great questions about the Institution, and *residency of Bishops*; whether *jure divino*. * Articles of Reformation to be joyned, in their consultations, with those of Doctrine and Religion. * The abrogating, or moderating, of the priviledges, and exemptions, of *Regulars*, from the Episcopal power; * the abrogation, or moderating of Commendams, Dispensations, Union of Benefices,—Of pensions, and reservations of profits, out of Ecclesiastical Benefices. * Ordination of Titular Bishops:—*Appeales* to the Pope. * The Councils representing the *universal* Church. All which, and many more were agitated in the Council, the Legats (as *Soave* represents them) relucting: yet, not offering to infringe the liberty of the Council, where *they* saw the inclinations of a considerable part bent that way.

† See *Soave*, p. 760, 766, 769.

‖ p. 192.

[So, *concerning residency, and exemptions Soave* tells us (the truth of the History frequently constraining him to contradict those maximes, which are elsewhere laid down by him, to infer the slavery of the Council.)—*That the Legats were inforced to consent that both should be considered of, and that every one speak his opinion of them, and that some Fathers should be deputed to frame the Decree, that it might be examined.* Concerning the *Articles handling Reformation*, p. 144, 145. he saith: *The number contending for them was so great, that the Legats were confounded. And that they yielded to their desire, being constrained thereunto by meer necessity.* Concerning *abrogating the exemption of Regulars*, p. 761, and, 167, 170. he saith. *It was a thing moved by the Bishops:—and that the Pope, and Legats desired to maintain the Regulars Priviledges.* Concerning admission of the Protestant Divines to disputation, p. 365. he

he ſaith,—*That, this opinion being embraced firſt by the Germans, then by the Spaniſh Prelats, and at laſt ſomewhat coldly by the Italian, the Legat remained immoveable; and ſhewed plainly, that he ſtood quiet, being forced by neceſsity.* And concerning *the reformation of Princes*, p. 769. he ſaith.—*That the Legats gave forth this Article being forced thereunto by the mutiny of the Prelats.* If you would ſee more inſtances in *Soave* of the Councils bridling, and over-ruling the Legats, I refer you to *Quorlins*, *l.* 2. firſt and ſecond Chapters, a diligent Collector of them. So, *p.* 656. concerning the ſeveral Articles of Reformation preſented by the Emperour, and by the French, † which were thought to intrench too much upon the Popes priviledges, *Soave* brings him in giving ſuch inſtructions to his Legats.—*That they ſhould defer to ſpeak of them, as long as was poſsible,—That, when there was neceſsity to peruſe them, they ſhould begin with thoſe that were leaſt prejudicial,* &c.—*That, in caſe they were forced to propoſe them, imparting their objections to the Prelats their adherents, they ſhould put them in diſcuſsion, and controverſie.* So, very frequently in his Hiſtory, you ſhall find him (as if he had forgot himſelf, concerning what he affirms elſewhere of the *domineering*, and *tyranny* of the Pope, and his party) revealing the diſtractions, the fears, the complaints, and, upon this, the ſubtile Artifices, of the Pope, and of his Legats (probably, ſuch as his own wit could contrive, who with his fancy preſumes to enter into all their ſecrets, and ſpeaks, as if he had the Art of diſcerning *thoughts* and *intentions* as clearly, as others do *actions* and *Records*,) and many times, as you have ſeen, after all theſe, he repreſents the Legats yielding, and going along with the ſtream, becauſe they could with no Art withſtand it. But if indeed the *proponentibus Legatis*, was intended, or executed in ſuch a manner, as Proteſtants affirm, ſo as that nothing could be moved in the Council, but what they pleaſed, though a major part deſiring it; nor any thing pleaſed them, that it ſhould be moved, which was prejudicial to the Popes intereſt, or Grandeur; this ſurely would have remedied, and prevented all theſe fears, and jealouſies of the Pope, and Court of *Rome*; ſuppoſing his Legats, as *Soave* alwaies repreſents them, ſtill true, and faithful to him.] But I ask, what matter of moment was there, how much ſoever diſtaſtful to the *Pope*, or *Court* of *Rome*, that, being preſented once in *Trent*, was ſtrangled before it came to be propoſed, and agitated in the *Council*. The *Articles* of *Reformation*, that were exhibited by the Imperial and French Embaſſadors, were, after ſome delay, taken into conſideration in the 24. and 25. Seſſions. † And here, when ſome Embaſſadors propoſed, that *Deputies*

† *Soave*, *p.* 513, 652.

† *Soave*, *p.* 751, 759.

puties might be elected for each *Nation*, to take care in the Council, of the ſpecial intereſt of it.—*The Cardinal of* Lorraine, *and the other Embaſſadors, both the French and Emperours, contradicted it* (ſaith *Soave*) *alledging that every one* [*i. e.* in the Council] *might ſpeak his opinion concerning the Articles propoſed; and propoſe others, if there were cauſe; ſo that there was no need to give this diſtaſt to the Pope, and the Legats.* Such a Liberty, then, *de facto* there was uſed in the Council: But, I ſay not, whether alwaies with that diſcretion that was needful; or, whether not with ſome Contradiction of ſome perſons of a ſounder judgment, than the reſt. Or, whether the Legats did not well, in putting ſuch bounds to this liberty, as they well could, either by uſing *perſwaſions* to the contrary, or by interpoſing *delaies*, till the firſt fervour was a little cooled, as to many points which they ſaw *unprofitable*, difficult, and apt to divide the Council into *parties*, and not tending to thoſe ends, for which this Council was chiefly aſſembled: Eſpecially, whilſt they endeavoured to win the reluctting party, though this were not very numerous, with *reaſon* and *treating*, rather than *force*, or *overvoting* them in Council.

§. 163. 4ly. Such a ſole priviledge of *propoſal*, to be appropriated to the Legats of the Apoſtolick See, further than for order ſake, ſeems needleſs to be contended for: For if (as *Soave* often ſaith) the major part of the Council, being Italians, were at the Popes devotion for deciding all matters, what mattered it, who, or what was, propoſed?

5ly. You may obſerve: That no ſuch preſcription, as *proponentibus legatis*, was made to the Councils proceedings, till *Pius* his time; and yet that all things, there, run in the ſame courſe before, as after, it: Neither do any Proteſtants eſteem the Council more free, or equitable, unto them, under *Paul's*, or *Julius's*, than under *Pius's*, conduct.

6. Laſtly, which muſt be often ſaid: as to the moſt, or all the Proteſtant Controverſies concerning *doctrine*, the Legats propoſal could be no diſadvantage; in condemning which doctrines the whole Council hath beeen ſhewed † to be ſo unanimous.

§. 150.

§. 164. To the 2d. The *Conſultation* in every thing made with the Pope. 1ſt. Whereas it is uſually urged by Proteſtants, out of *Soave*, † That as none could propoſe any thing in the Council ſave the *Legats*, ſo the Legats might propoſe nothing, till they had received a *Commiſſion* from *Rome*.—*That nothing was reſolved by the Fathers, but all in* Rome; *and the Council guided by the Holy Ghoſt*,

To 2. 1.

† See p. 481, 507.

Ghoſt, ſent thither from time to time in a Cloak-bag from Rome, † much more is charged, than is true. For a propoſal of the matters, from time to time to be *diſcuſſed* in Council, was made, and digeſted in *Trent* by a general agreement of the Fathers, unknown to the Pope, as appears throughout this Hiſtory. After which reſolved, 1ſt. ſome *Congregations* of *Divines* diſputed the point, and conſidered the matters propoſed, at which any of the *Fathers*, that would, might be preſent. 2. After this arguing, followed the Congregations of the *Prelats*, for *framing* the heads of *Doctrine*, and *Reformation*, according to the moſt common opinion. 3. Then a *General* Congregation of the ſame Prelats, for giving their *votes* concerning them; and, 4. laſtly the *Seſſion*; when they were voted again, and ſo publiſhed (See *Soave*, *p.* 167.) Now all or moſt part of theſe, ſaving the laſt (the Seſſion) were uſually paſſed without the Popes knowledge, or concurrence; and the Legats themſelves are ſometimes found differing from one another in their votes (as they were in that of reſidence, †) at which time alſo ſome other Biſhops gave their vote, with *reſervation* to conſulting of the Pope: which ſhews the Popes mind (though in a matter ſo much concerning the Apoſtolick See) was not then known. But after theſe General Congregations was uſually notice of ſuch *Decree*, as was paſſed therein, ſent to *Rome*, before its being voted again, and publiſhed in the *General Seſſion*: And of this a charge is alſo given to his Legats by Pope *Paul* the Third, in *Soave*, *p.* 164. though I find not, that *Pius* required it: Nay, if we may believe this Hiſtorian, he ſeemeth in ſome places to decline it (as appears in the quotations here following:) The *Decree*, thus ſent to *Rome*, was there alſo by the Popes *Council* examined; and his judgment returned to the Legats, concerning it: which, when differing from that of the Council (which thing ſeldom happened, except in the queſtions between the *Epiſcopal* and *Papal*, Rights) the Legats endeavoured to procure by common conſent either ſome *alterations*, or at leaſt, an *omiſſion* of ſuch Decree, in the following Seſſion; but this with all freedom of the Council ſtill obſerved (a good part of whom was alſo ſtill animated againſt the Popes intereſts by the Embaſſadors of Secular Princes) nothing being done againſt the ſatisfaction of any conſiderable part of the Council; the uttermoſt of the Legats attempts, then, extended to procure an *omiſſion* of that, to which the Pope would not conſent; not any *determining* of what he approved, when thereby was feared the alienating of ſome Nation from the Roman Faith; and if, thus, ſomething was hindred, by their intermiſe, from being paſſed by the Council, which otherwiſe

† *p.* 497.

† *Sav. p.* 528. and, 496

wiſe would have been ſo, yet nothing was advanced to be paſſed, which otherwiſe would not have been: and ſo the Conciliary Acts have ſuffered no prejudice by it. Nor any hurt done, ſave that thus men are left to their former *Liberty* ſtill in ſome points, wherein the Council would have reſtrained it; a thing, I hope, the Reformed will not complain of; you may at your leiſure particularly view in *Soave* the liberty the Council took to examine the Popes propoſals in the *Inſtitution* of *Biſhops*, and *Papal Supremacy*; and the alterations, which were made in them.

† p 657. & 723.

§. 165. 2. In the next place, I will give you the *Pope's* plea for himſelf, againſt thoſe, who accuſed him for thus abridging the *freedom* of the Council. To this matter, then, friendlily complained of by the Emperor in a letter to him, thus anſwered *Pius* the 4th in another (See *Pall. l.* 20. *c.* 8. *n.* 7.) —*That he never gave any ſuch command, as that nothing ſhould be decreed in the Council, without conſulting him firſt. That in things more difficult, the Delegats demanded his advice; nor could, or ought, he to deny it them. That it croſſed not their liberty, was not undecent, or unuſual, that the Council it ſelf ſhould deſire the judgment of the Apoſtolick See.* —*Nor was it unfitting, that the Pope, being to give Counſel to his Legats, ſhould firſt take it with the Cardinals, men of great judgment, and learning; eſpecially he not intending, that his advices ſhould impoſe any neceſſity on the Council to follow them.* Thus *Pius*; me thinks, with much reaſon. And it is manifeſt, that the Council in many things did not follow them. And though little was decreed by the Council againſt that which came from *Rome*; yet both all, that came from *Rome*, was not decreed; and much decreed, that came not from *Rome*; the Pope often deſiring them, eſpecially for *reformations*, to proceed without conſulting him: and (in *Soave*, p. 503.)—*complaining to his Cardinals, of thoſe* [in the Council] *who referred themſelves unto him; becauſe* (ſaith he) *the Council was aſſembled, that every one may deliver his own opinion, and not lay the things of difficulty upon the back of another* [i. e. the Pope] *that themſelves might avoid hatred, and envy.* As alſo the ſame Author † relates; That, his Legats ſending to *Rome* the *Articles*, that were drawn up in the Council, of the *Inſtitution*, and *reſidence* of *Biſhops*, the Pope reprehended the Legats for ſending them.—*Becauſe he knew, that the major part in the Council were good Catholicks, and devoted to the Church of* Rome, *and in confidence hereof he was content, that the propoſition, and reſolution ſhould be determined in* Trent *without his knowledge.* The ſame Author † makes him further, in defence of his *Inſtructions*, from time to time ſent to his *Legats*, and to the Council, anſwering the ſame letter of the Emperours

† p. 723.

† p. 684.

Emperour on this manner: plauſibly enough, though, as *Pallavicino* taxeth him, miſrelating in ſeveral things the contents of the *letter.*† —*That no Council was ever celebrated in abſence of the Pope, but that he hath ſent inſtructions; which the Fathers have alſo followed: That the Inſtructions do ſtill remain, which Pope* Celeſtine *ſent to the Epheſin Council; Pope* Leo, *to that of* Chalcedon; *Pope* Agatho, *to that in* Trullo, *Pope* Adrian *the firſt, to the ſecond of* Nice; *Pope* Adrian *the ſecond, to the eighth General Council of* Conſtantinople. And, thus alſo he makes him to plead his cauſe at *Rome* before the Cardinals.† —*That he could not chuſe but be troubled with that which was ſpoken concerning the liberty of the Council; and that to conſult of the matters at* Rome, *was to violate it; ſaying, that it was a ſtrange thing, that he, who was head of the Church, and the Cardinals, who were principal members, and the other Prelats in* Rome, *who have voice in the Council, ſhould be accounted ſtrangers, and might not be informed of what is handled therein, and ſpeak their opinion; when as thoſe, who have no lawful part in it, hold it lawful to intermedle, and that in an ill ſort. That it is plain, that the Prelats went to* Trent *with commiſſion from their Princes, according to which they proceed; and that the Embaſſadors by letters, and perſwaſions, do compel them to follow the intereſt of their Maſters; and yet for all this, no man ſaith (which ſhould be ſaid) that the Council is not free.* Thus *Pius* in the Conſiſtory. And indeed, had not only the Pope, but alſo *all* the abſent *Biſhops* in the world aſſembled a Council of their Clergy, and ſent their *judgment* from time to time to *Trent* (ſo long as the Council was not obliged to follow it) this would have brought no ſubjection, or diſhonour, but have added more reverence, to its Decrees, enacted after they had firſt been ſifted by ſo many ſeveral Examinations. Nor do I ſee, how the Popes, *Paul*, or *Pius*, their *Conſultations* with their Council of Biſhops at *Rome* before every Seſſion of *Trent* concerning the points to be determined therein; and upon it, declaring their judgment to the Legats, or to the Council (provided they uſe no unlawful practiſes for the corrupting of any ones judgment) ſhould be more thought to preſcribe to, or to diminiſh, the freedom thereof, than the precedent *conſultations* uſed anciently in *Provincial* Councils, concerning ſome point afterward to be defined in a *General*, was held prejudicial to it: or than Pope *Celeſtines*, or *Leo's*, precedent Letters to the third and fourth *General Council*, declaring their judgment concerning what was to be diſcuſſed there, may be thought an unlawful preſcription to them; though the Hereticks, condemned by theſe Councils, excepted againſt it. And, *de facto*, what Secular Prince was there, whoſe

† *l.* 20. *c.* 8. *n.* 9.

† *p.* 503.

Orators in the Council acquainted him not continually with the actions thereof, and accordingly received new inſtructions for their negotiations?

§. 166. To what hath been ſaid, I have one thing more to add: That as ſuch a frequent reconſulting the *Apoſtolick See* was unuſual in many former Councils, ſo there was not thereof, in them, the ſame neceſſity: becauſe ſuch Councils being aſſembled for the determining ſome one, or a few, points of Controverſie, the Popes Legats received full Inſtructions concerning the faith of the Roman See therein, before their firſt coming: but in ſo many controverſies of all ſorts, as here came to be agitated, it was impoſſible for that Biſhop, either fully to pre-inform his *Miſsioners*, or to foreſee the *queſtions*: As *Canus*, who was one of this Council, long ſince obſerved, in *Com. loci, l. 5. c. 5.* And if it be ſaid, that the Popes preſence in the Council might have prevented all ſuch trouble, and offence, his abſence ſeems rather eligible for this, that ſo he might do all things with more *mature* advice, and leſs precipitancy, on whoſe judgment the affairs of the Council did chiefly depend; to which may be added, what himſelf urgeth to the Emperour: † that his *perſonal preſence* there then would have ſeemed to tend much more to the overawing and oppreſſing of the Councils *liberty*.

† *Pallav.* l. 2. c. 8. n 4.

§. 167. To 3. To the 3*d*. [1] The *great* number of *Italian* Biſhops: and, [2] the not voting by Nations. Of the firſt of theſe, the thing being confeſſed, theſe things may be ſaid; * That ſuch a thing, without the Popes particular deſign, would have happened; theſe Biſhops being much nearer, than thoſe of *Spain* and *France*, and not having the like impediments, of Lutheraniſme, and National Colloquies, as the Germans; * that, ſuppoſe the Pope had ſent them all, the charitable may clearly ſee another cauſe thereof, than only their driving there of the Popes intereſt: namely, the ſometimes great *ſcarcity* of Biſhops in the Council; eſpecially, at the firſt opening of it. * That, if other Biſhops were hindered to be preſent, the frequency of the Italians, how numerous ſoever, if of ſuch as had lawful Suffrages, cannot be blamed, though the abſence of others be excuſed. That as the Pope was diligent to ſend in theſe, ſo was he very ſolicitous, by writing to their *Princes*, to procure a fuller Repreſentative from other *Nations*: as appears frequently in the Hiſtory; and ſo alſo was the Council it ſelf (and the Italians therein) which Council alſo had proceeded to lay heavy mulcts upon the *Abſents*, had not the

the Embaſſadors interceded, and in part excuſed them. Of which ſee before, §. 71. * That, though the Italian Biſhops in general are confeſſed to be inclined more than others, to maintain the Popes honour, and greatneſs; yet ſo many of them, as were not beneficed in the Popes ſtate, and ſubject to his temporal Dominion (which was very inconſiderable in reſpect of the reſt of *Italy*) if we may believe *Soave*, were addicted much more to their own *Princes*, in things wherein their Embaſſadors craved their aſſiſtance, than to the Pope; as on which Princes they had a greater dependance in reſpect of their Eſtates, their Parentage, *&c.* than on the Pope. Therefore we find not only thoſe of the *Imperial*, or *Spaniſh* States of *Italy*, but the *Venetians*, and *Florentines* in ſeveral things to have divided from thoſe of the *Papacy*. See *Soave*, *p.* 504, 559, 558. * That nothing could be paſſed in the Council, as to matters of doctrine, if a *conſiderable* part contradicted, though a *major* part favoured it; and that the non-Italians were never but accounted (in reſpect of the Nations repreſented by them) a conſiderable part; ſo that, to *hinder* ſomething from being voted, ſuch a number of Italians was, or might be, made uſe of; but to *vote* any thing they alone were eſteemed uneffective; and the omiſſions of the Council may be ſometimes charged upon them, but not the Acts. * That, whether the Pope had the Suffrages of the Italian Biſhops at his beck, or no, he had no need of any ſuch aſſiſtance for the *Proteſtant-Controverſies*: in condemning of which, *Soave* confeſſeth the votes of the whole Council to concur; as hath been ſhewed before as to many particulars, §. 150, and ſee *Soave*, *p.* 182, 183. ſaying. *That as to thoſe points, like a City beleagred, the factions among them ceaſed, and all joyned againſt the common enemy.*

§. 168

Laſtly, as to thoſe *Controverſies*, wherein the Council was more divided, and the Popes *ſingle* intereſts were more nearly concerned; * That, *de facto*, he had no ſuch aſſiſtance of the greateſt part of the Italian Biſhops; nor the major part of the Council at his command, to vote what he pleaſed. This alſo frequently appears from *Soave*'s own relations. In theſe he makes often mention of the *Biſhops* of *Naples*, and *Lombardy* (the greateſt part of *Italy*) their conforming to the Emperor, their Soveraigns, inclinations, and their being ſteered by his Embaſſador; and ſpeaks ſeveral times of the *Imperial* Italian Biſhops their oppoſing the *Papalins*. (See *Soave*, *p.* 166, 172, 223, 259, 267, 375.) And what motive theſe Prelats had in the former time of the Council to follow the *Emperors* intereſts, the ſame had they, in the later end thereof, to follow the King of *Spaines*, to whom,

and not the Emperour (after the Kingdom of *Spain*, and the Empire diſunited) belonged theſe Dominions in *Italy*; || and therefore in this time we find many of them ſiding with the Spaniſh Prelats: See *Soave*, *p.* 558, 609. * He mentions alſo (*p.* 558.) *an averſion, and envy, which the other Italian Biſhops had againſt thoſe, favoured, and preferred by the Court of* Rome: Beſides this, * He repreſents elſewhere the Venetian, and Florentine Prelats alſo to comply with the Intereſts of thoſe States, importuned hereunto by the Embaſſadors: || and therefore (*p.* 504.) brings in the Pope applying himſelf to theſe Embaſſadors.—*That their Princes would recommend the cauſe of the Papacy to their Embaſſadors in* Trent, *and command them to cauſe the Prelats of their States not to be preſent in the Parlies againſt the Apoſtolick See:* Again: * He relates their joyning (all, or a great part of them) with the other Biſhops, againſt the indeavours of the Pope, and his Legats, in all thoſe controverſies moved concerning the *Epiſcopal duties, and rights, Inſtitution, Reſidence; Exemption of Regulars*, &c. named formerly; † as likewiſe concerning *the non-remitting of Reformations to his Holineſs.* † *The Permiſſion of the Cup*, carried negatively againſt the Legats, † and ſeveral other matters; † all which things the *Council* could not have done, contrary to the Popes mind (as *Soave* will have it) without a conſiderable number of *Italian* Prelats oppoſing him, ſince theſe were the major part of the Council. So (p. 660.) He brings in the French Embaſſadors complaining of the *Secretary* of the Council, as not faithfully ſetting down the *votes*, which ſhews, that they apprehended a major part, oppoſit to that which prevail'd. Laſtly, (which may confirm all this,) * He is every where diſcovering the Legats, and the Popes fears and jealouſies, and various cunnings, and divertions, to compaſs their ends; often brings in his *Holineſs*, making grievous complaints againſt the Council's proceedings, and againſt his own Legats too,; ſeveral times, thinking to *diſſolve* the Council, ſometimes, to ſecure himſelf by *Armes*; || often ſolliciting the ſecular Princes to move their Biſhops in his behalf, † ſometimes relying on the help of ſome eminent perſons in the Council; as on the Cardinal of *Lorraine*, † and others, * So (*p.* 258.) He brings in Pope *Paul* the Third, reſenting.—*How little he was eſteemed of the Council; in that It, having given hope to refer the Reformation to him, whereof he had framed a Bull, and recalled the whole matter to* Rome, *they had after treated thereof more ſharply, without any reſpect to his Authority: That he ſaw, that all was in the Emperours power,—and was aſſured, that the Prelats, who did alſo then adhere to the Court of* Rome, *when ever the Emperour ſhould unmask*

|| See *Soave*, *p.* 694.

|| See *p.* 559.

† See *Soave*, *p.* 231, 468. 496, 551, 559. 609, 711.

† 254, 144, 145.

† *p.* 559, 567,

† *p.* 699, 769.

|| *p.* 551.

† *p.* 504.

† *Soave*, *p.* 766.

unmask himself, would profess to be on his side, either for fear of greater power, or for emulation at the Popes Greatness; which they would discover, when they should see a secure way laid open to moderate it. * And (*p.* 515, and, 516) upon occasion of Residency, he represents,—*The* Court *of* Rome *exclaiming, that a Schisme was plotted in the Council, and an Apostacy from the Apostolick See; and* Pius *the 4th complaining both of the Prelats, and of his own Legats; that all were united against him,* &c. Yet this, after that the same *Soave* had related † the Popes sending so many *pensioners* of his to carry all things by a major number of votes on his side. And, *p.* 628, Again, he makes the same Pope to break out into this exclamation, occasioned by the points of *Institution*, and *Residency* of *Bishops*: —*That all the Bishops, beneficed by him, were his opposites; and that he maintained an Army of Enemies in* Trent; *wishing that by any means the Council were dissolved.* * (*p.* 260.) He makes one Legat, consulting, how to mollify the combin'd Prelats, by his granting some of their petitions: Another saying;—*That, to condescend to an Inferior (especially to a multitude) was to make them to demand a greater satisfaction; that, first, he would try his Friends, and, when he found himself fortified with the greater number, would not retire an Inch: but, if he found it otherwise, he would use Art.* *p.* 171. He makes, * the same Legats negotiating with the Italian Bishops by those Prelats, who were their assured Friends, to wish them to consider, how much they were bound, for the Honour of their Nation, to uphold the Dignity of the Papacy: And, *p.* 754, * the Legats to be accused by the Spanish Embassador, for soliciting the *Italians* for their Suffrages. What means this great Politian thus, amongst their impregnable Italian Guards, and Votaries, in the Council, to torture the *Pope*, and his *Legats* on this manner, about procuring their aid; and to put them into so many suddain frights; and, so oft as he pleaseth, entring into their Cabinet-Councils, to bring them upon his Stage, full of new *Projects*. And yet, no sooner are their backs turn'd; and the *Princes Orators*, or the *Spanish Prelats*, entered upon it, and it come to their turn to speak, but the scene is quite changed; and we find these on the same rack: Now, the Council is kept in servitude by the Italians their *plurality* of voices, all of them sure to the Pope, for *Country*, or *Pensions*, or *Promises*, or *Fears*. Now the *proponentibus legatis* strikes all the Council speechless, as to the matters *Fundamental*, and of greatest concernment: And sometimes the Prelats of one Nation sometimes of another, are ready to *protest*. Writing contrary things, as they seem best to humor and adorn his

† *p.* 504.

his preſent ſubject; and, as they do, alſo, ſome way, or other, ſerve his ſiniſter *ends*, many times contrary, one to another. For, the more of the Council he can make, in one place, to oppoſe the Pope, and his Miniſters in ſome point, the more here, he makes to appear the *Popes tyranny* in hindering, with divers arts, ſuch things to be defin'd. And, in another place, the more powerful, and numerous he can ſhew the Popes Dependents in the Council to be, the more he repreſents the *Council enſlav'd*, and the Pope carrying all things therein, as he pleaſeth. This is replied to the *number* of *Italian* Biſhops.

§. 169. As for the other thing, the voting by *Nations* (and not by the number of perſons preſent) a way, propoſed to remedy the predominancy in the Council of ſome *one Nation*, the inconvenience but now complained of. 1ſt. It is a *new* way, never uſed in any Council, ſave two late ones, *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*: and in *Conſtance* upon an extraordinary occaſion, the *election* of a *lawful Pope*, * when they were affraid, this Election would receive ſome diſturbance from the multitude of Italians, brought to the Council by Pope *John* 23th. and when ſeveral Nations alſo, adhering to ſeveral perſons (for there were then no fewer than three Anti-Popes reſiding in ſeveral places) probably would not have united in any new choiſe, that would be made without their particular conſent. Therefore alſo, in the Council of *Conſtance*, for the *Election* of a new *Pope*, *Martin* 5th. there were joyned, with the *Cardinals*, ſome other choſen *Prelats* out of each *Nation*. (See *Seſs.* 41.) And this extraordinary way was then uſed, not as the beſt for condemning of *Hereſies*, but as, *pro tempore*, the moſt expedient, for curing a *Schiſm*. Mean while, ſee in *Spondanus*, || taken out of the *Acts* of this *Council* conſerv'd in the Library of St. *Victors* at *Paris*, the complaint, and exceptions made by Pope *John* againſt this new courſe.—*Una natione* (ſaith he) *alteri æquiparata, abſ; ullâ meriti, vel numeri, ratione,—cum de Angli-canâ eſſent tres tantum Prælati, & cæteri Clerici novem numero.* And then, ſee the Council thus clearing it ſelf.—*Formam, à Synodo, majoris cauſâ ordinis & Compendii, ſtatutam, comprehendere utrumq; modum deliberandi; per Nationes, & per ſingula Suffragia: Cum Viz. per Deputatos, ſive Delectos Nationum, primo, ſeparatim poſt ad invicem, communicato Conſilio; Dehinc, per ipſas Nationes, ubi ſinguli liberi erant: tandem, collectis omnibus in unum Nationibus, ac Cardinalibus, in Seſſione publica quærebatur palam de ſingulis præmeditatis, & examinatis, Articulis, utrum placerent; permiſſâ cuilibet, ex priſcâ Conciliorum forma, facultate dicendi, quæ vellet.* We have the manner of it more clearly deſcribed in *Spondanus* out

|| *A.D.* 1415. *n.* 14 & 16.

out of *Patricius*, in the beginning of the Council of *Basil* † thus. † *A. D.* 1431. 18.
Out of the four Nations was a certain number chosen, to sit by themselves, and prepare matters, the four Nations having four *Convents* or meetings: Again, out of every one of these Convents were chosen three; twelve in all, called *Deputati*, who sate together, and better digested, what any of the other four meetings represented to them: afterward their Judgment was return'd to the several Convents; and then, when all, or any three of these Convents consented in any thing, it was sent to the *President* of the *Council*, and by Him proposed to all the members of it in a *General Congregation*; where all had their *free*, and *personal* vote; and what was in this Congregation generally agreed on, was at last reduced into the Form of a *Decree*, and afterward recited, and confirmed in a *Publick Session*. Where we see in the General Congregation all things are passed by personal votes: (which proceeding also, the former words of the Council intimate, and justifie,) Only the other National Consultations are premised for the more expedition, and better examination of things: and nothing could be proposed to the General Congregation, but which the Deputies of three of the four Nations had first stated, and agreed to. Now, setting aside such a distinction of, and prevoting by, Nations, the preparation and examination of matters before every publick Session by certain select Congregations, or meetings, seems not much different from that afterward used in this Council of *Trent*. 2. But this, whether *previous*, or *final*, Decision by the number of *Nations*, how few soever the *Representatives* of some of them be, as it is *new*, so, 2*ly*. seems very dangerous for raising emulations, and factions between Nations (to the rending of the Churches peace) and leaveth not the *Prelats* of every *Nation* so much at their own liberty to joyn their vote with aliens; nor permits the same scope for men of more *spirit*, *learning*, or *judgment*, of whatsoever Nation to guide the rest. 3*ly*. It would render the Councils deserted, and unfrequented, and consequently the affairs thereof not so well discussed: whilst *one Representative*, sent from one Nation will suffice; and equal in vote, and authority, an hundred sent from another; as here, only three Prelats sent from *England* did. 4. Again, either *all Nations* shall be allowed to have an *equal* vote in the Council, or *unequal*; *if equal*; then, since the Bishops of three or four lesser Kingdoms, or States, do not equal the Bishops of one greater, thus a much smaller part of the Church may overvote, and conclude the greater; *if unequal*, how shall a just proportion be prescribed? 5. Add to this, that the *multitude* in Council of the *Prelats* of some Nation more than of another,

another, is, without this new device, already remedied; for this being once agreed on, that the decrees of the Prelats preſent in a Council oblige not, unleſs accepted by the *major* part of *Nations*, and by their *Prelats*, that are abſent, the greater number of one Nation in the Council than of another, cannot oblige the abſents, if more, to the obſervance of their decrees. 6ly. Such an Innovation could not be made in *Trent* without the conſent of the Council; and thoſe Nations, of which the Council moſtly conſiſted, would never have conſented to have the vote of *one*, or *two* Biſhops from ſome other Countries, perhaps much inferior in their natural, or ſpiritual, parts, and their Co-Patriots unconſulted, to counterpoiſe all theirs.

7. Laſtly, as to the points of *doctrine*; the ſame thing in effect was obſerved in the *Council*, or ſomething more; For nothing can be ſhewed to have been paſſed in the Council, as to matter of doctrine, from which the Biſhops, how few ſoever they were, of any one Nation, eſteemed Catholick, and ſo rightly challenging a vote, declared their *diſſent*; and, though perhaps few, yet they were looked upon, as the repreſentative of a Body conſiderable, againſt which (as hath been ſaid) the Council concluded no *Article of faith*; as in ſtating which Articles they guided themſelves by former evident *Tradition*, or moſt clear *Conſequences* thereof.

§. 170. To 4. To the 4th The *Popes* giving *Penſions*. The thing is confeſſed, but hath two handles, by which, as it is taken, it is rendred commendable, or culpable. On the one ſide it might be a great *charity*, and argue a deſire only, that the Council might be *numerous*, and *full*, and aſſiſted with many able perſons, ſome of which (not minding theſe ſo much) are not unoften *low* in their *eſtates*. On the other ſide, it might be a great *policy*, and argue a deſire to have many in the Council his *Dependents*. Whether out of one, or both of theſe reſpects, ſuch *penſions* were allowed, I cannot ſay: but by an act, that may be lawfully done, and juſtified, none can prove the Council illegal: And alſo in favour of the former pretence, we may conſider: * That *poorer* Biſhops in former Councils have had their charges born, at leaſt, by the *Emperor*, one not without *Deſigns*: * That the *Council* of *Trent* ſate extraordinary long in compariſon of other Synods; the charges of continuing there great; not a few Biſhops, and other Divines, poor: great ſcarcity of Biſhops attending the Council, eſpecially in its firſt beginning; the more neceſſitous, without ſome maintenance of their charges, threatening to depart: as *Soavo* himſelf acknowledgeth,

acknowledgeth, p. 124: and therefore the Legats themſelves were forced to open the Popes purſe for the ſupport of ſome of them, before they had his leave; and (ſaith *Pallav. l. 24. c. 14. n. 7.*) theſe *penſions* were ſo ſmall, being but 25 Crowns a month, that the Biſhops ſo reliev'd, ſtaid not without murmuring, that, thus, they were deprived of a juſt pretence to go away; and the Pope had more ill-will from them for their ſo long neceſſitated attendance, than thanks for his allowance; and, often complaining of their want, ſome of them (ſaith he) in the conſultations, gave more *moleſtation*, than ſome *others*, both to the Legats, and to the Pope. But, if theſe *penſions* were ſo advantagious to the Popes ſervice, it had been eaſie for *Chriſtian Princes*, by the like allowances to ſo many *poor* Biſhops of their own Dominions, to have countermined ſuch policies.

To the 5th. The *admitting Titular Biſhops*. 'Tis true, §. 171. that ſome *Titular Biſhops* were in the Council, but they are juſtified, by their, allowed, *ordination* of *Prieſts*, to be *true* Biſhops; To 5. and therefore might lawfully repair to the Council, and vote therein without asking any ones leave. I find not any ſaid to be in the Council, who were not made Biſhops before it. Neither do I find *Soave* charging the Pope, as ſome others do, either of erecting any *new Biſkopricks*, or creating *Titular Biſhops*, during the ſitting of the *Council*; nor yet any mentioned to be ſent thither by the Pope, ſave two, and thoſe at the firſt beginning of the Council, nor theſe meerly Titular, *Iaus Magnus*, and *Robert Venants wancap*; One Archbiſhop of *Upſali* in *Sweden*, the other of *Armagh* in *Ireland*, both excluded from their Sees by *Princes*, *enemies* to the *Catholick Faith*. Of whom, as you may read what is ſaid in *Soave*, p. 140. to their diſparagement; ſo you may ſee what is ſaid in *Pall. l. 6. c. 5.* and in *Spondanus* † to their commendation: The Pope ſending them thither as for their great † *A. D.* parts, ſo chiefly for their Country, one being a *Swede*, the other a 1546. *n.* 3. *Scot*, that *moſt Nations* might have ſome perſons in the Council *relating* to them. Laſtly, if there were any ſuch Titulars ſent by the Pope, the ſame may be ſaid of them, as hath been † of the † §. 167. Italians in general: * That the Pope found but little aſſiſtance from them, where he moſt needed them; nor was any advantagious thing done for *Him* in the Council by their help: * That the Council was a great enemy to ſeveral practiſes of theirs, and paſſed † *Conc. Trid.* ſeveral Acts againſt † them (when probably had there been any *Seſſ. 6. c. 4. de Deform.* conſiderable number of them in the Council, ſome of them would *-- Seſſ. 14. c. 2*

have ſpoken, there, in their own defence) eſpecially, that they ſhould exerciſe no Pontifical Act on the Subjects of another Biſhop without his licence. But yet the Council thought not fit to ſuppreſs, for the future, the creating any ſuch Biſhops, for the reaſons given in *Soave*, p. 717. *Becauſe theſe neceſſary to ſupply the places of unable Biſhops; or, of thoſe, who have a lawful cauſe to be abſent from their Churches; or of Prelats, imployed in greater affairs.*

§ 172. To 6.

To the laſt. The prohibition of Biſhops *Proxies* to give *definitive votes*: *Proxies* were admitted in all *Conſulations*, and had, in them, a vote with the reſt, but were not admitted to have a definitive vote in the Council for this reaſon: leaſt ſo, whilſt many Biſhops pretended neceſſary cauſe of abſence, theſe their *Subſtitutes*, coming abundantly from all parts, might *overbear* the Biſhops in the Council; theſe being men, of whoſe abilities the Council could not have the ſame preſumption, as they might of the Biſhops themſelves; and this being a thing, which thoſe *Prelats*, who afforded their own *perſonal* attendance, would be much offended with. Yet was it attempted, to have allowed a definitive vote to the Proxies of ſome Biſhops *neceſſarily* abſent, as to ſome of the *German Biſhops*, but that this could not be eaſily done, excluſively to others †. Whether their definitive vote alſo was oppoſed for another reaſon (alledged by *Proteſtants*) *viz.* leaſt the *Italian* Biſhops ſhould ſo be *over-voted*, I cannot judge: But thoſe Biſhops, who ſent Proxies, themſelves afterward, *accepting* the Council, did what was equivalent to their own, or their Proxies, *definitive* voting in it. But, to conclude this matter, ſuppoſe that theſe ſix things objected were confeſſed to have been uſed unjuſtly, and to the prejudice of the Council, in ſome things; yet it appears from the ſecond and third Conſideration above, §. 148, 150. that they could caſt no blemiſh upon its authority in thoſe things, which were therein, *actually*, and *unanimouſly*, eſtabliſhed; which is enough to overthrow the *Reformation*.

† See *Pall. l.* 20. *c.* 17. *n.* 8.—*l.* 21. *c.* 1. *n.* 3.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

IV. Head. *Of the Councils many Definitions, and Anathemas.*

1. *That all Anathemas are not inflicted, for holding ſomething againſt Faith,* §. 173.
2. *That matters of Faith have a great latitude: and ſo conſequently, the errors, that oppoſe Faith, and are lyable to be Anathematized,* §. 175.

Where;

Of the ſeveral waies, wherein things are ſaid to be of Faith. §. 176.

3. *That all General Councils to the worlds end have equal Authority in defining matters of Faith: And, by the more Definitions, the Chriſtian Faith ſtill more perfected,* §. 177.

Where,

Of the true meaning of the Epheſin Canon, reſtraining Additions to the Faith, §. 178.

4. *That the Council of* Trent *prudently abſtained from the determining of many Controverſies, moved there,* §. 184.
5. *That the Lutheran's many erroneous opinions in matters of Faith engaged the Council to ſo many contrary Definitions,* §. 185.
6. *That all the Anathemas of this Council extend not to meer Diſſenters,* §. 186.
7. *That this Council, in her Definitions, decreed no* new Divine *Truth, or* new *matter of Faith, which was not formerly ſuch, at leaſt in its neceſſary Principles.*

Where,

In what ſence Councils may be ſaid to make new Articles of Faith, and in what, not, §. 192.

8. *That the chief Proteſtant-Controverſies, defined in this Council of* Trent, *were ſo in ſome former Councils,* §. 198.
9. *That the Proteſtant-Churches have made new Counter-Definitions as particular as the Roman; and obliged their Subjects to believe, and ſubſcribe them,* § 199.
10. *That a Diſceſſion from the Church, and declaration againſt its Doctrines, was made by Proteſtants before they were any way ſtraitned, or provoked, by the* Trent-*Decrees, or* Pius *his Creed,* §. 202.

THus much (from §. 147.) touching the *third* Head, the *Legal* proceedings of this *Council*. Now we come to the §. 173

Fourth: Touching the many *Decrees* and *Canons*, *Definitions*, and *Anathema's*, of this *Council*, much exceeding those of former; and some of them said to be in very slight matters; by which this Council is charged to have multiplied, and imposed on *all* Christians, so many *new Articles* of *Faith*; and *Pius* his *Bull*, that followed it, to have added *twelve new ones*, to the *Creed*. *Thus when as the Reformation* [as Mr. *Thorndike* complains, in Conclusion to his *Epilog.*] *might have been only Provisional, till a better understanding between the parties might have produced a tolerable agreement, this Council cut off all hopes of Peace, except by yielding to all their Decrees.* In this matter therefore, for the *Councils Defence*, I shall propose to you these ten *Considerations* following.

1. The 1st. That all *Anathemas* in Councils are not passed, for holding something against *matter* of *Faith*, but for other misdemeanours, and Trespasses against *Obedience*, and good manners; Amongst which this may be reckoned one; If any one raiseth Factions, and Sects, and disturbeth the Churches peace, in *contradicting* her common Doctrines, of how *small* consequence soever these Doctrines be; or spreadeth abroad propositions *schismatical*, and scandalous, and apt to corrupt good manners, or, be made ill use of by the simple, though the matter of them be not properly *Heretical*, or opposing an *Article*, that is *De fide*.

Again, *Anathemas*, that are inflicted by the Church for holding something *contrary* to the *Faith*, are not alwaies, or most usually denounced, for those more *fundamental* and *necessary* points of Faith, an error in which ruines *Salvation*; but also, and more commonly (because these are more) for some *lesser* matters of faith; *viz.* any, whereby some damage, smaller, or greater, comes, as to the Author from holding them, so to others, from his maintaining, and divulging them abroad: The *Church* being very vigilant (contrary to Sects) to eradicate the least deviations from the Faith; which are observed by the Apostle to be of the nature of a *Cancer*, still eating further into the bowels of Truth; she not knowing, how far they may enlarge themselves, and by little and little invade higher Points, and lay the Foundation for more pernicious errors. Nor doth the punishment of Anathema, in these, eye so much the *greatness*, and malignity of the error, as the *pertinacy*, and obstinacy of its Abettor, refusing submittance to the Churches authority; the violating of which *Authority* may be a great fault, and of very ill consequence, though in a small matter. *If he will not hear the Church* (saith our Lord) *let him be to thee, as an Heathen* † [an excommunicated, or anathematized, person] where the censure lies upon his *not hearing* the Church; be the matter in which, small, or great.

1 Tim. 2. 17.

Mat. 18. 17.

And

§. 174.

And the great guilt of the *obstinacy* against the Definitions of *Superiors*, though in the maintaining only of some *small* errors in the Faith, some Protestants seem to acknowledge: and confess it well to merit so high a Censure. Of which thus Dr. *Fearn*,

† *Considerations on the Church of* Engl. *Preface.*

† —*We acknowledge, that he who shall pertinaciously, and turbulently speak, and teach, against the Doctrines of the Church in points of less moment, may deserve to be Anathematized, or put out of the Church; for such a one, though he deny not the Faith, yet makes a breach of Charity: whereby he goes out of the Church, against which he so sets himself.* Thus this Doctor. [Only he would have the *Church* to distinguish between *pertinacious* and *modest*, gain-saying, (which is to know Hearts:) and this *latter* he would have to pass free from this *censure*; and such he would have that of the *Reformers* to be. Was that of *Luther*, then, so modest? Or doth not the weight and venerableness of the *Churches Authority* render all known contradiction whatever truly guilty of *Pertinacy*, and *Pride*?]

† *Vindic. of Church of* Eng. *p.* 27.

Again: Thus Bishop *Bramhal*. † —*When inferior questions, not fundamental, are once defined by a lawful General Council, all Christians, though they cannot assent in their judgments, are obliged to passive obedience, to possess their souls in patience. And they who shall oppose the Authority, and disturb the peace of the Church* [for such a point non-fundamental] *deserve to be punish't as Hereticks* [*i. e.* Anathematized.] And Cardinal *Bellarmin* saith † of Provincial Councils: That —*Judicium non infallibile tamen sufficit ad excommunicandum.* And —*Debent privati homines acquiescere ejusmodi judicio, donec non judicaverit aliter* Apostolica sedes, *vel* Concilium Universale, [these two, it seems, only do set at liberty our tongues from the obligations of *Inferiour* Councils] *si secus egerint, merito excommunicantur.* Notwithstanding, though an *Anathema*, in such cases is well deserved from the wilful adherence of such persons to their own fancies, against their Superiors, yet it is never inflicted meerly for this; but alwaies for some danger also in such a Tenent, if spread abroad to others; the remedy of which danger of infecting others, seems chiefly to be intended in the Churches using ordinarily in such *Canons*: *Si quis dixerit*, rather than, *senserit*.

† *De Concil. l.* 2. *c.* 10.

§ 175. 2.

2. Concerning the *Extent* of matter of Faith, You must know: That all *Divine Revelations* whatever, and all necessary *Deductions* from any *Article* of *Faith*, could they proceed *in infinitum*, are also, when known, the matter or objects, or Articles, of our faith, as well as the more chief, necessary, points thereof; (unless we may dis-believe something, that we grant to be *God's Words*)

And,

And are all. *Traditional* from the Apoſtles times, either in their own expreſs terms, or in their neceſſary *Principles*, ſince new Divine Revelations none pretend: And, conſequently, the contrary *error* to any of theſe *Deductions*, when ever it ſeems very hurtful, may be *Anathematized*.

§. 176. And, amongſt theſe *Divine Revelations*, and matter of our Faith, are to be reckoned theſe two Propoſitions of no little conſequence; *viz. the Doctrine of Chriſtian liberty*; namely; That all things are *lawful* unto us, which *God's Word* hath not prohibited. And, again, this; That the *Church* hath authority committed to Her by our Lord, in ſuch *lawful* things, to make *Conſtitutions*, and *Decrees* obliging all her ſubjects to obedience. So that one, that affirms ſomething to be prohibited in God's Word, or unlawful, that is not ſo prohibited; or one, that denies obedience to the *Precepts* of the *Church*, made in things not contrary to God's Word, offends againſt the *Faith*; and, on this account, is liable to an *Anathema*. And, in theſe things, our *Belief*, according to the ſeveral objects thereof, is required of us in a ſeveral manner.

1. In pure *ſpeculatives*; If it be a thing made known to us to be revealed *by God*, the *Faith*, that is required of us upon ſuch *Revelation*, is to believe it a certain *Truth*. 2. In practicals, if it be a thing, *by God* commanded, or prohibited, the *faith* required of us, upon ſuch Divine *Revelation*, is to believe, that it is our neceſſary *Duty* to do, or to abſtain from, it. 3. But, if it be a thing of which we have no Divine Precept; a thing neither injoyned, nor prohibited by God; in all which ſort of things *Divine Revelation* hath declared our *liberty*, the *faith* required of us, according to ſuch Revelation, is, to believe it *lawful* (I mean as to God's law) to be done, or to be omitted, as we pleaſe. 4. Laſtly, Among theſe *lawful* things alſo; if it be a thing concerning which we have a Precept of the Church to do it; or, where the lawfulneſs is doubted of, a Declaration of the Church, that it is lawful to be done (which *Church God* in his Word hath commanded, in ſuch her judgment, to be ſubmitted to; and, in ſuch her Precepts, to be obeyed) the *Faith*, required of us from ſuch Divine Revelation, is: That it is both *lawful* to be obſerved; and, the obſervation thereof our *Duty*. And conſequently, he who denies the lawfulneſs thereof, or obedience thereto, oppoſeth a Divine Revelation: Though the thing, we do, is not commanded by any Divine Revelation; nor the particular lawfulneſs of it declared in Gods Word. Such a point of Faith is the lawfulneſs of *communicating* only in *one* kind: Of which thus the Council of

Trent.

Trent; Seſſ. 21. c. 1. —*Si quis dixerit, ex Dei præcepto, vel neceſſitate ſalutis, omnes, ſingulos & Chriſto fideles utramq; ſpeciem ſanctiſſimi Euchariſtiæ ſacramenti ſumere debere, Anathema ſit.* Such the Duty of communicating once a year, *Seſſ.* 13. *c.* 9. —*Si quis negaverit, omnes, & ſingulos Chriſti Fideles utriuſque ſexus, cum ad annos diſcretionis pervenerint, teneri, ſingulis annis, ſaltem Paſchate, ad communicandum, juxta præceptum Sanctæ matris Eccleſiæ; Anathema ſit.* And, ſo the ſeventh and tenth Canon. —*Si quis dixerit, non licere*, &c.. And ſuch that, *Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 4. *De matrimon.* —*Si quis dixerit, Eccleſiam non poſſe conſtituere*, &c. *Anathema ſit*: and ſo, *Can.* 9. And ſuch is the Duty in general of obſerving the *Churches Traditions.* Of which thus the ſeventh General Council (Act. 7.) —*Si quis Traditiones Eccleſiæ, ſive ſcriptas, ſive conſuetudine valentes, non curaverit; Anathema ſit.*

3. That all *Councils* to the worlds end, and not only the *four*, or *three*, firſt, before the paſſing of the *Epheſin Canon* † (which Canon is ſaid to reſtrain it) may *define* and *determine* not only the *greater*; but theſe *ſmaller* matters of *Faith*; and may make new Points to be, *de fide*, or *creditu neceſſaria* (in ſuch a ſence, as is explained below, §. 192) which were not formerly, when they ſee occaſion thereof; and, when contrary errors do ariſe, which they apprehend dangerous to Divine *Truth*; or to *good life*; or to the Churches *peace.* And there ſeems no reaſon againſt it, but that a Council may be as ample in the *protection* and aſſerting of *Truth*, not only in groſs, and in ſome general, and principal matters, but by retail, as it were, in every part, and parcel thereof; as Innovations are, in *invading* it, that every poiſon may have its Antidote; Eſpecially, when little-ſeeming errors, not cruſhed at their firſt appearance, do inſenſibly aſcend, from the overthrow of ſome concluſion, to that of the Premiſes; till they undermine, at laſt, ſome Truths more principal. Who blames a Parent for binding his Children to abſtain from things hurtful, becauſe ſuch things are, in a *leſs* degree, and not *exceedingly*, hurtful; or, for prohibiting them ſomething, which is not down-right poiſon, and immediatly mortal; but yet, which by little and little may alter, and corrupt the healthful conſtitution of their Body: Of which noxious things the *Parents*, not the Children, are fitteſt *Judges.*

§. 177 3.

† *Conc. Epheſ. c.* 7.

Neither are the Churches *Subjects* any way diſobliged in her thus, from age to age, multiplying their Credends; but much indebted, for this her motherly care of them: who before, whilſt they had more liberty of opinion, ſo alſo had leſs light, in their progreſs toward Heaven; and more by-paths open to ſtray in, and

and more liableneſs to erre; or, by the Heretical, to be ſeduced in thoſe things, in the truth of which they are now, by that Judgement, which Gods wiſdom hath deputed to direct them, and by the beſt which the world can afford, eſtabliſhed. Unleſs here, with the *Hereticks*, we will blame, after the Foundation laid of the *Apoſtles Creed*, the *explications* of the *Nicen*, or *Athanaſian*: Or, after this, the many Articles paſſed in later Synods, concerning *Grace*, and *Freewill*, and the *Anathemas* annexed againſt the Pelagian errors herein: Or alſo complain of the obligation we now have to a great Roll of *Credenda* under the *Goſpel*, from which thoſe, in the darker times of the Law, ſtood free. Add to this, that the ſuppreſſion of any new *error* muſt *neceſſarily* increaſe the *Faith*: and, in immediat contraries, who is to renounce the *Negative*, muſt believe and hold the *Affirmative*: Neither is it poſſible, that the Church, in ſuch points, can make any fence to keep out her enemies, but ſhe muſt alſo at the ſame time, within it, incloſe her Friends.

§. 178. It is much urged, indeed, by Dr. *Hammond* in anſwer to the C. Gentleman 8. *cap.* §. 2. and repeated in *Hereſ.* §. 7 *p.* 100.) and by Biſhop *Bramhal*, and others, ſee before, §. 6. *a.* (*α*)—*That* the Epheſin, the third General, Council, made a *Decree*: *That it ſhould not be lawful, for any man to produce, write, or compoſe, any belief, beſides that which* not *eſtabliſhed by the Fathers at* Nice, &c. *c.* (*β*) *That the Greeks in the Council of* Florence *preſſed this authority to the Latines; and ſaid that no man would accuſe that faith* [or Creed] *of imperfection, unleſs he were mad.* *y.* (*γ*) *That the Latines in their reply, acknowledged that this Decree did forbid all* difference *of faith from this Creed, as well as* contrariety: And, *δ.* (*δ*) *That* Celeſtines *Epiſtle (quoted in that Council) affirmeth; That the belief delivered by the Apoſtles* [*i. e.* the Apoſtles Creed] *requires that there be neither addition, nor diminution.* Theſe things are urged, to ſhew; that the Council of *Trent* had no juſt authority to make any *new Articles* of *Faith*. But I imagine; that, after you have but a little with me conſidered this *Epheſin Canon* with the due circumſtances, you will diſcern a ſtrange miſ-application.

1. It is meet, that I firſt ſet you down the words thereof, with what immediatly precedes them.—*Sermocinatio ejuſdem Sancti Concili, poſtquam, & Canones editi a.* 318. *Sanctis, beatisq; Patribus, qui Nicea convenerant, & impium Symbolum à Theodoro Mopſueſtino Epiſcopo* [a ring-leader of the Neſtorian Hereſie] *confictum, & eidem Epheſino Concilio traditum à Clariſio Presbytero Philadelphienſi, recitata fuiſſent.—His igitur recitatis conſtituit ſanctum Concilium,*

Concilium, ut nemini liceat aliam fidem vel proferre, vel conscribere vel componere, quam eam, quæ prælituta, ac præscripta est à Sanctis Patribus, qui in Nicenorum urbe [in which Creed the additions also of the Constantinopolitan Council are here supposed to be included] *cum auxilio spiritus sancti coacti fuerunt. Qui autem audeat aliam fidem vel componere vel proferre, volentibus converti ad agnitionem veritatis sive ex Gentilitate, sive Judaismo, &c.* [to be professed by them at their admission into the Church] *ut hi, si quidem Episcopi sint, ab Episcopatu removeantur; sin autem Laici sint, ut extremâ detestatione, & execratione percellantur.* This being the Canon.

To (*a*) I say. 1st. That, this *Canon* being pressed by the *Greeks* against the *Latines* in the Florentine Synod to prove the unlawfulness of the *Latines* addition to the Creed of [*Filioq.*] either the Reformed must approve the sense the Latines gave of that Decree [namely, that the Ephesin Council prohibited only, that none should compose any model of faith disagreeing, or *contrary* in any thing to, the doctrine of the Nicene Creed (as *Theodorus* his wicked Creed was, which occasioned this Decree)] or must confess, that the *Latines* unjustly retain, and mention [*Filioq.*] in their *Creeds*; which was added to the Creeds, after the Ephesin, and the four first Councils; † being first mentioned, and found in the Creed, in the fourth Toletan Council, about, *A. D.* 680. as the Roman Writers themselves confess. § 179. n. 2. R. To *a*. †See *Conc. Florent.* 7. *Sess.*

2ly. That, supposing the Council prohibits not only the composing, or addition of any thing *contrary* to the *Nicene* Creed (as *Theodorus* his Nestorian Creed, the occasion thereof, may perswade, it did) but the *addition* thereto, or alteration in expression, of any thing whatsoever, though never so conformable to the Nicen Creed; yet this prohibition extends not to *Councils*, but only to *private* persons, and *Church-Governours*; according to that, [*Hi, si quidem Episcopi sunt, ab Episcopatu removeantur:*] for who shall execute this sentence upon a *General Council*? Or, how can one *General Council* justly limit, or prescribe to *another* of equal authority? 3ly. Supposing that they extend this Act to *Councils* also; either they prohibit to them not the making *new* definitions in matters of Faith, but only the *adding* of such definitions made to the *body* of the *Nicene* Creed; but then, this act concerns none, who afterward make new Definitions, so they add them not to the Creed. Now no additions at all have been made to that Creed, since the fourth General Council, save [*Filioq.*] which the Protestants also allow of, and use. Or, 4ly. If the *Ephesin Fathers* prohibit to the Councils any such Definitions also, as well as *Additions to the Creed* after *Nice*, they con-

demn themſelves in the firſt place; who though they added not to the Creed, yet *defined* [Maria Θεοτόκος.] And if the Epheſin Canon be taken in either of theſe ſences, thus it will be found not to be obſerved by the very *next General* Council, that of *Chalcedon*; who made another *new definition*, or Creed, againſt *Eutyches*; in which alſo they altered ſome expreſſions of the Nicene Creed (as is noted by the Latines *Concil. Florent.* §. 6.) *altered* [*natum ex Patre* (1.) *ex Subſtantiâ Patris*] into [*Conſubſtantialem Patri ſecundum Divinitatem, nobis autem ſecundum humanitatem*:] and added many other things, as appears in their Confeſſion of faith (*Seſſ.* 5.) which Confeſſion they conclude, and ſeal up, juſt after the ſame manner, as the Epheſin Council before them did: —*Decrevit ſancta utq; univerſalis hæc Synodus aliam fidem nemini licere proferre, ſive conſcribere, aut exponere, vel ſentire. Sed eos, qui audent vel componere, vel tradere aliud Symbolum volentibus ſe convertere, &c. ſi Epiſcopi ſunt, alienos eſſe ab Epiſcopatu, &c. ſi Laici, Anathematizari.* 5ly. That both *Leo* Biſhop of *Rome*, and *Flavianus*, and *Euſebius*, being charged by the Eutychian faction, as offending againſt this *Decree* of *Epheſus*, in their aſſerting as a part of their *Faith*: *Chriſtum ex duabus, & in duabus ſimul naturis eſſe*, an Article not contained in the Nicene Creed, were cleared by the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, as not guilty thereof, who (ſome of them probably the ſame, who ſate in the Epheſin Council; that being only twenty years before this) underſtood it in the ſence of the Latines, and urged the neceſſity of additions; as appears in the ſpeech of that Council to *Flavianus* the Emperor. † 6ly. Taken in ſuch a ſence, as to forbid to Councils no: only the adding to the Nicen Creed, but alſo the defining, any new thing in matter of faith, it is (as was ſaid before) not only *null*, by an equal authority reverſing it in this ſenſe, but moſt *irrational*; ſince the like occaſions of making ſuch new definitions may happen at any time after this Epheſin Council, as it did before, and alſo in, it.

† See *Conc. Florent. Seſſ.* 1.

† See below §, 183. *n.* 1.

§. 180. To *c*. To *β*. If the Grecians meant [*imperfection*] in reſpect of the *expreſs Confutation* of any *error* againſt faith, then both the authority of the Latine Church, and all the reaſons given above, may be produced againſt them; but if they mean [*imperfection*] in reſpect of containing all Credends in reſpect of *ſalvation* neceſſary to be *explicitly* known, it's granted; that ſo is the *Apoſtles Creed* not *imperfect*; yet were additions to it lawfully made by *Nice*.

To

To γ. The Latines joyn [*contrary*] also to it, when they name [*different*,] and mean only such difference, as is also *contrary*: as is clear every where by their words, in that Synod *Sess.* 11. *Julianus Cardinalis* thus. —*Quæ quidem verba* [*i. e.*] *Concilii Ephesini*] *nos credimus hoc solum significare, ut fas sit nulli, Nicænorum Patrum fidei contrarium proferre.* Is the addition [*filioq,*] which Protestants justifie, nothing *diverse*? then neither shall any other new definitions of Councils be so? §. 181. To γ.

To δ. *Celestines* words, which are spoken of the Apostles Creed, either do not prohibit other Councils making some sort of additions; or do condemn *Nice* for it. But see this testimony explained by the Latines (*Sess.* 10.) that he meant only, denying any thing, delivered in the Apostles Creed, or asserting or adding any thing, contrary to it. §. 182. To δ.

To conclude this matter: see the defence, which the Fathers of the fourth General Council, following the Ephesin, made to *Marcianus* the Emperor, in the Conclusion of that Synod, † concerning the *necessity* of making, from time to time, new *Definitions*, and *Additions*, to explicate, and corroborate the former *Faith*, as new errors arise to debilitate, or pervert it; returned in answer to the *Eutychians*, and others, who, to obtain liberty to their own opinions, accused *Leo's* Epistle, and also the Council, of *Innovations* in matters of *Faith*, after the Churches Doctrine sufficiently established in the *Nicen Creed*. There—*Credentibus quidem* (saith the Council, apologizing for it self) *sufficit, ad utilitatem, Fidei* [*i. e.* Nicenæ] *in discussa* [*i. e.* without further consequences multiplied from it] *prospectio.—His autem, qui doctrinam rectam pervertere molsuntur, ad singula, quæ malè pariunt, oportet occurrere; & eorum objectis propria quaq; providere. Nam si omnes contenti, essent fidei* [Nicenæ] *constituto* [which, indeed, may also be said of the *Apostles* Creed] *& pietatis semitam nullâ innovatione turbarent, deceret Ecclesia Filios* [in Councils] *nihil amplius excogitare: Sed quia multi a rectâ lineâ per anfractus erroris exorbitant,—necesse nobis est, veritatis eos inventione convertere, commentaq; eorum devia salutaribus adjectionibus refutare; non, ut novum ad pietatem (quasi fides desit) semper aliquid exquirentes: sed ut, contra ea, quæ ab illis innovata sunt, excogitantes, qua salubria judicantur.* Thus that Council apologizeth for its new Definitions. Where *Excogitare*, and *veritatis inventione*, and the adversaries object n; to them *Innovation*, &c. shew, that Councils may define not only expres *Traditionals* in matters of faith, but any *new conclusions*, extracted from such Traditionals. §. 183. n. 1. † *Allocut. ad Marcianum*

§. 183. n. 2. Neither ſeems it to be much material. 1. Whether the *Definitions* of latter Councils, when inſerted into former Creeds, be called *explanations* and *Declarations* of, or *Additions* to, the former *faith* (which was a great conteſt between the *Greek* and the *Latine* Church in the Council of *Florence*:) provided, they be only ſuch things, as are granted to be *neceſſarily* educed out of former *Principles* of *faith*. 2. Nor, 2ly, much matters it, as to the *aſſent*, that ought to be yielded to them, when known to be the *Churches* Definitions; whether they be not inſerted into former *Creeds*; but delivered apart. For an obligation we have to the one ſort, as well as to the other. For example: There is no leſs an obedience due to [*Maria θεότοκος* or, *Dei Genetrix*: intimating the *unity* of Chriſts *perſon*, though compounded of two diſtinct *Natures*] defined by the third General Council, though not interpoſed in the Creed; than to [*one Baptiſme*,] or, [*Filioq;*] which were, ſo, interpoſed. Only, it ſeems, that an *Inſertion* into the *Creed* is purpoſely made of thoſe *points* of faith, which among the reſt, are conceiv'd more neceſſary (not only, to be *aſſented* to, when known, but) to be explicitly *known*, by every *Chriſtian*; or in infected times, fit to be diſtinctly confeſſed by every *Catholick*. Though yet ſo indifferent was this matter, as to principal points; That *Maria θεότοκος* which, the Greeks urged in the Council of *Florence*, † that it was forborn to be added to the *Nicen* Creed by the *Epheſin* Fathers, yet is found, in terms equivalent, to be put in the *Athanaſian* Creed [*Not two, but one Chriſt by unity of Perſon:*] and this allowed of by the Reformed: and, again, found, in expreſs terms, to be put, in the Definition of their Faith (according to ſome Copies) made ſhortly after, by the Council of *Chalcedon* (See *Seſſ.* 5.) where alſo, before the paſſing of this *Definition*, the Fathers cryed out againſt the Neſtorians — *Iſta fides Orthodoxorum. Sancta Maria θεοτόκος ſcribatur — In Symbolo ſic addatur.* † As likewiſe afterward, found to be put, in expreſs terms, in the Creed of the fourth Toletan Council. The like may be ſaid of [*One Baptiſm for Remiſſion of ſins*] defined indeed againſt the Novatians by the Nicen Council, but by the ſecond General Council of *Conſtantinople*, firſt mentioned in the enlarged Creed. The like of that clauſe [*they that have done evil into everlaſting fire*] omitted in the Conſtantinopolitan, but put in the Athanaſian, Creed, perhaps againſt the Origeniſts, who held the fire temporary; and, *malos, poſt purgationem malorum, regno Dei, luciq; reſtituendos* ‖ Nay, In the now-receiv'd Apoſtles Creed it ſelf there ſeems ſomething to be additional, inſerted by latter times (*propter nonnullos Hæreticos*, ſaith *Ruffinus*, *in Expoſitione Symboli*) not found in

† *Seſſ.* 5.

† *Seſſ.* 5.

‖ *Auſtin de Hæreſ.*

in the prime Copies thereof; at leaſt, not in thoſe anciently uſed in the Roman Church; [as *Deſcendit ad inferos*] and [*vitam æternam.*]. See the Authorities quoted by Archbiſhop *Uſher*, *De Symbolo Apoſtolico veterum Rom. Eccleſiæ.* This, in Explication of the much miſ-underſtood Epheſin Canon, urged as prohibiting, any future *additions* to the *Nicen* Creed; or, the following ages *enlarging* the Articles of the former *Catholick Faith.* Now to proceed.

4. That many *Controverſies*, and *Queſtions*, ſtarted in this Council of *Trent*, yet, becauſe they had not ſufficient *evidence* in *Scripture*, or *Tradition*, to decide them, were left unſtated by it. For which ſee what hath been ſaid formerly, §. 149. And great prudence, and care was uſed, that nothing ſhould paſs there, from which any conſiderable number diſſented. And *Pallavicine* obſerves, || out of ſeveral Regiſters of the Councils Acts, whereof he had the peruſal, that *Soave*, perhaps the more to trouble, and muddy the clearneſs of the Catholick Doctrine, as it oppoſed that of the Innovators; or to ſhew his own *Reading*, in points, where there happens to be any *difference* among the *Schoolmen*, doth many times bring-in the skirmiſhing of the *Theologs*, one with another, concerning them, when as, in Reality, there was no ſuch conteſt amongſt them in the Council. Though, on the other ſide, this is not denied ſeveral times to have happened: and perhaps ſome of the Diſputants deſirous, that their own tenents might paſs for the common Doctrine of the Church; but, as I ſaid, the Legats, and others, not ingaged in ſuch a quarrel, by their great judgment compoſed ſuch ſtrifes, without giving in the *Seſſion*, and the *Decree*, the victory to either ſide; a moderation much complained of by the *Proteſtants*, the Spectators, who from thence might have hoped ſome *ſchiſme*, and the riſe of a *civil war* in the *Catholick* Communion. §. 184. 4. || *l.* 12. *c.* 8. *n.* 4.

5. That the *Lutherans* broaching ſo many erroneous poſitions, and joyning together the tenents of ſo many ſeveral Sects that had been before them, innovating ſomething in every part of Divinity, cauſed the *Council* of *Trent* to multiply ſo many *Anathemas* againſt them, and joyn together alſo the reſults of many former Councils; This being the courſe obſerved in the Council; firſt, for ſome ſelected perſons to read the *Lutheran* writings on the ſubject in hand, and to collect out of them the *erroneous* and *noxious* propoſitions; and then, for the whole Council, when ſuch propoſitions upon examination, were unanimouſly diſallowed, to anathematize them (though ſome among theſe of much leſs malignity than others) eſpecially, all thoſe *errors*, which were deſtitute of the patronage §. 185. 5.

of

of some reverend *Father*, or other writer, of the Church; for where the Council found any such Patronage, they used them more gently, and prosecuted them not with the like vehemency. And, seeing that, in the proceeding against *Sects*, some former Councils were wont only to condemn the Sect in general, and make mention only of the chief heads of their doctrine; other Councils again, more punctual, descended to the condemning of all the particulars; this latter way was rather taken by the *Council* of *Trent*, not without mature consideration had in the beginning of the Council, concerning it; which is related by *Soave*, p. 192. where he saith,—*That one part desired, that four, or six fundamental Articles of the new doctrine might be chosen and condemned,—following the example of the ancient Councils, which having declared the principal Article, condemned the heresie, never descending to particular propositions, but condemning* [in general] *the books of the Hereticks; That, in that universal, they comprehended all the pernicious doctrine; and that the honour of the Council so required. But the other part* (saith he) *aimed to put under censure all the propositions, which might receive a bad construction, that those* [amongst them] *might be condemned, which in reason did deserve it; saying, that it was the office of a Pastor to discern intirely the wholsome grass from the hurtful; and not to suffer the flock to tast of this. And if the example of ancient Councils ought to be imitated, they should imitate* * *that of* Ephesus, *which made so many, and so famous, anathematisms against the doctrine of* Nestorius, *that these did contain whatsoever the heretick had said;* * *and the Councils of* Affrica, *which descended to the condemnation of all the propositions of the Sects* [see *Conc. Milevitan.* against the Pelagian doctrines: *Conc. Gangrense: Syrmiense: 2. Nicæn Act.* 7 and lastly the *Council* of *Constance*, condemning forty five propositions of *Wickleff*, and thirty of *Jo. Huss.*] *the first opinion, did undoubtedly propose a more easie way, and would have left a chink open for an agreement, which future times might produce: yet the second was embraced,* &c. Thus *Soave*. As for the former way *leaving a chink open for agreement*, It may be more easily credited, when we shall see an agreement advanced in those points, handled in the 25th Session; where the Councils determinations are so brief, and general, as the Council escaped not, for this generality also, the censure of *Soaves* Chorus: † as elsewhere it incurs their displeasure for mincing matters too much, and making every thing, moved, an Article of Faith.

† p. 822.

§. 186. 6. That *all* the *Canons* in the Council of *Trent*, that have *Anathema* affixed (all which, except a very few, † run only in the form:—*Si quis dixerit* [do not] *in*joyn assent, under Anathema, to the

† See *Sess.* 4. & *Sess.* 5. c. 1.

the contradictory propolition, nor make it an Article of Faith neceſſary to be believed, under the penalty of being reputed an Heretick, unleſs (ſaith *Canus* †) the decree, to which ſuch Canon relates, bind to aſſent, with a—*Firma fide credendum*:—*Hoc eſt dogma fidei catholicæ.*—*Contrarium aſſerentes* [or *tenentes*] *judicentur pro hæreticis*: Or ſome other equivalent expreſſion; or unleſs the Canon run, *Si quis hoc ſenſerit.* And Cardinal *Bellarmin* ſaith much what the ſame † *Quando autem Decretum proponatur tanquam de Fide, facile cognoſcitur ex verbis Concilii, Semper enim dicere ſolent,* [1] *ſe explicare fidem Catholicam*: —[2] *vel, (quod eſt communiſſimum) dicunt Anathema, & ab Eccleſiâ excludunt eos, qui contrarium ſentiunt.* [But then, what, if it be only *Anathema in, qui contrarium dicunt*, or *docent*?] *Quando autem nihil horum dicunt, non eſt certum, rem eſſe de Fide* Thus *Bellarmin.* For this Council doth ſometimes expreſly anathematize, or excommunicate, for *teaching*, or *publickly defending*, of ſome error; or, for accuſing the *Church* of *error* in her teaching the contrary; when it doth not anathematize the *holding* of ſuch an error. An example of which *ſee, *Seſſ.* 24 *c.* 7.—*Si quis dixerit Eccleſiam errare, cum docuit, & docet, juxta Evangelicam, & Apoſtolicam doctrinam propter adulterium alterius conjugum Matrimonii vinculum non poſſe diſſolvi,* &c. *Anathema ſit.* Where the Council anathematizeth thoſe, who *condemn* the *Church* of *erring* in teaching ſuch a doctrine (as *Luther* did condemn the Church,) but doth not anathematize thoſe, who hold the contrary doctrine; as the Greek Church doth, to whom the Council in this decree was favourable, in paſſing the Anathema not on the holding ſuch an error, but only on any ones cenſuring the Church of error, for holding otherwiſe. Now one, who holds an opinion for truth, may be highly culpable in *accuſing* thoſe, who hold the contrary, of *error*; either, becauſe himſelf may be miſtaken in what he holds; or becauſe he may be uncharitable, or alſo diſobedient, in divulging all that he knows. (I add this in reſpect of what *Soave* objects, about this matter, p. 733. and 790.) *See the like, *can.* 8. and 4.—and *Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 2.—*See likewiſe, Seſſ. 13. *c.* 11. where in reſpect that ſome approved Writers, † both ancient, and modern, (amongſt whom *Cajetan*) had held, † *See Pallav. l.* 12. *c.* 2. *n.* 7. *n.* 12. concerning *Sacerdotal Confeſſion* to precede *Communion*, the contrary tenent to that which the Council approved, it doth not anathematize, or excommunicate thoſe, who held the contrary doctrine, as Hereticks; but excommunicates thoſe, *qui contrarium docuerit, prædicaverit, vel pertinaciter aſſeruerit, ſeu etiam publice diſputando defenderit, præſumpſerint* [*i. e.* for the future] as perturbers of the † *Com. loc. l.* 5. *c.* 5. Churches peace, as *Canus*, one preſent in the Council, obſerves. †

† *Com. loci. l.* 5. *c.* 5.

† *De Concil. l.* 2. *c.* 12.

§. 187. So, in the Canon about the *canonical* books of *Scripture*, *Seſſ.* 4. [*Si quis pro ſacris, & canonicis non ſuſceperit*] being only expreſſed in this Canon, and [*pari reverentiâ venerandis*] omitted (which had ſome oppoſers) *Pall. l.* 6. *c.* 14. *n.* 3. (whilſt of the three draughts that were propoſed, † every one had ſome maintainers) no perſon ſeems, under *Anathema*, to be any further obliged, than only to hold theſe books *ſacred*, and *canonical*: A thing obſerved by Mr. *Thorndike*, *de Ratione finiend. Controverſias*, *c.* 28. *p.* 565. Neither yet is there any Injunction in this Council concerning the books called Apocryphal, *pari reverentiâ venerandos eſſe*; but only this ſaid: *Synodus pari reverentiâ veneratur*: which hath not the Form of a *Decree*. Where alſo *pari reverentiâ* may be underſtood ſo, as that, whilſt in ſome reſpect, it equals theſe Apocryphal books, with ſome of the others, (as the Proteſtants call them) generally held Canonical; as perhaps, with *Eſther*, *Ruth*, *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, *Proverbs*, *Eccleſiaſtes*, &c. yet doth it not therefore, in *every* reſpect, equal them with *all*; as namely *Tobit*, or the book of *Wiſdom*, with the five Books of *Moſes*; or the four *Goſpels*. Some parts of the Canon being much more, neceſſary, and dignified, than ſome others.

† See *Soave*, *p.* 155. — & Biſhop *Coſin*. *Hiſt.* of Canon, *c.* 18. §. 192.

And then; as for this expreſſion, equalling at leaſt thoſe Books, called Apocryphal, with ſome *Canonical* fore-named, and its accepting them all, as equally penn'd by the direction of the *H. Spirit*, I ask; What new *Diſcerner* of *Spirits* will aſſume to himſelf ſo much skill, as clearly to diſcover the language, and character, of the Spirit in the one ſort of theſe Books, that is not in the other. For Example in *Proverbs*, or *Eccleſiaſtes*, that is not in *Eccleſiaſticus*: Eſpecially; 1. When as, the *Churches* ancient reading them all promiſcuouſly in *her publick ſervice* for the Inſtruction of her children, ſhews; that ſhe held the doctrine of them all *ſound*. 2. And, again, when as, in thoſe Books, which all ſides allow *canonical*, yet the H. Spirit pens them in ſo many various and unlike ſtiles; and ſome of theſe much more rude and unpoliſhed, than others; and ſpeaks ſometimes in a much higher, ſometimes in a much lower, key; as if it condeſcended to receive a mixture with, or tincture from, the natural parts, and Elocution of its Scribe: and, only the *Truth* being entirely preſerved, admitted alſo ſometimes his Infirmities as to Language, Method, Perſpicuity, *&c.* In which *Canon* alſo, ſome of the *Hiſtorical* books (though preſerved from error) ſeem not penned from immediate Divine Revelation, ſo, as the *Prophetical*; but, by uſing ſuch humane induſtry, and diligence, as other Hiſtories are compiled with. For which, ſee St. *Lukes* Preface to his Goſpel. 3. And laſtly, when,

as

as there are ſome ſeeming *Antilogies*, and incongruities produced in the one ſort of theſe books, called Apocryphal; ſo are there others, as many, as great, urged, in thoſe receiv'd by all for canonical; eſpecially, in the *Hiſtorical*.

§. 188. [Therefore it ſeems a great inadvertency (if nothing more) in Biſhop *Coſin* (writing ſo large a Treatiſe on this ſubject,) Where he ſaith† —*That this Council commanded all the Books recited in their Canon to be equally accepted, and taken with the ſelf ſame veneration, as having all a like abſolute, and divine authority annexed to them, without preferring one before another: and damned all the Churches of the world beſides, that will not, thus, receive that Canon* [of Scripture] *upon their own terms.* Quoting in the ſame place, for juſtifying this *charge*, theſe words, as the words of the *Council.*—*Concil. Trid. Seſſ.* 4 —*Omnes libros pari pietatis affectu, reverentiâ, & veneratione, pro Canonicis, receperit.*—*Ibid. Si quis autem non ſuſceperit*, &c. *Anathema ſit*; whereas there are no ſuch words, in the Council, ſo put together.—*Si quis non ſuſceperit*, or, *receperit, omnes* [*hos*] *libros pari pietatis affectu reverentiâ, & veneratione, pro canonicis, Anathema ſit* [which words will only ſerve the deſign of his Book;] But only theſe words there uſed with relation to Anathema,—*Si quis hos libros integros*, &c. pro ſacris & canonicis *non ſuſceperit, Anathema ſit.* And I hope in this Decree, (as to any words or expreſſions uſed therein) ſtiling them only *Sacri & Canonici*, the Council proceeds no further in affirming any thing concerning them, than, the Biſhop will concede, the *African Council*,† *Innocentius*, *Auſtin*, and other Fathers, to have done: and than himſelf alſo in a large ſence will acknowledge them to be. For, he, in giving anſwer to the Fathers, §. 82. writes thus of them.—*In a large and common ſence, as they be books appointed to be read in the Church for the more ample direction, and inſtruction of the people*, &c.—*(in which ſence that Council* [viz. of *Carthage*] *took them) or, as they are to be preferr'd before all other Eccleſiaſtical Books (in which ſence St.* Auſtin *took them) and as they are oppoſed to ſuppoſitious, Apocryphal and rejected Books (in which ſence both St.* Auſtin, *and this Council, beſides divers others of the Fathers, took them) all theſe waies they may be called Canonical.* Thus he. And then, for the ſence of theſe words; ſince he alſo advanceth thus far toward the Councils, *pari pietatis affectu, ac reverentiâ ſuſcipit*, as to acknowledge —*theſe books to have been* [as read in the Church, like as other parts of Scripture, ſo] *cited, and termed by ſundry of the Fathers*, Sacred, and Divine, and Holy Scriptures, and Prophetical writings,† (Epithites common to theſe with other Scriptures) Why may not theſe infer alſo, in a

† *c.* 7. §. 81.

† Conc. *Carthag.* 3. *c.* 47.

† *Ibid.* §. 77.

large and common ſence, a parity; If the Biſhop will be pleaſed to mollifie the Councils expreſſions ſo, as he doth thoſe Fathers? By which Tradition and teſtimony of the Fathers [*Orthodoxorum Patrum exempla ſecuta* †] the Council, as it ſaith, was guided in making this Decree.

† *Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 4. Decret. de canon ſcript.*

A 2d. inadvertency of the ſame Reverend Biſhop ſeems to be, that which he urgeth much, † *of the ſmall, and inconſiderable number* [which that Council had] *to give a ſuffrage to this their Synodical Decree: and that forty Biſhops of* Italy, *aſſiſted, peradventure, with half a ſcore others, ſhould make up a General Council for all* Chriſtendom, &c. Whilſt he takes no notice, * that by how *few* ſoever this Decree was paſſed at the firſt, yet it was afterward, by the great Body of this Council under *Pius*, confirmed, and ratified; and this Ratification again by the moſt of Chriſtian Churches accepted: of which ſee before, §. 72, 75, 77. And again, * That not one Book more was voted *ſacred* and *canonical* by theſe Fathers in *Trent*, than had been voted before, as high as St. *Auſtins* times, by the *third Council* of *Carthage*: to which St. *Auſtin*, amongſt others, ſubſcribed; and, than were, in thoſe times alſo, generally received for ſuch, in the Weſtern Church; and laſtly, *that, as ſeveral of theſe books are declared *Canonical* by this *Council* after ſome *doubt*, formerly, had concerning them, ſo are others not only declared *Canonical* by *Proteſtants*, but as fully believed as the reſt, and in every reſpect equalled with them, as *the Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, *the Epiſtle of St.* James, *the ſecond of St.* Peter, *the ſecond and third of S.* John, *the Apocalypſe*, which were formerly, *viz.* till the fourth age, ſubject to the like *diſputes*: || and, as St. *Jerom* || ſaith of one of them,—*Paulatim, procedente tempore authoritatem obtinuerunt. Paulatim*, viz. as the *conformity* of theſe books with the reſt of the *Canon*, and the ſlightneſs of the objections made againſt them, and the former Tradition, was clearlier diſcovered, after the vaniſhing of thoſe *Sects*, that chiefly oppoſed them. As therefore ſeveral pieces of the *new* Teſtament, once diſputed, have ſince been declared, and generally received into, the Canon, ſo may thoſe pieces of the *old* Teſtament be, by the following *Chriſtian* Church, admitted for ſuch, though formerly rejected by the *Jewiſh*. For though the Churches Declaration in theſe matters alwaies depends on *Tradition*, yet, not on that *Jewiſh Tradition*, enemies to any writings that favour Chriſtianity (as theſe Books, we ſpeak of here, do; and ſo let them ſhut up the Canon of their Books prophetical, ſtrictly ſo taken, where, and when they pleaſe; but, on that Tradition and teſtimony, which the *primitive* times received from the *Apoſtles* (who had the gift of *diſcerning*

§. 189. † *See in him,* §. 194.

See *Chemnic. Exam. conc. Trid. 4. Seſſ.* || *De viris illuſtribus in Jacobo.*

diſcerning ſpirits) concerning their Books: nor need we, for any Scripture, aſcend higher than Tradition Apoſtolical. In which Apoſtles times Mr. *Thorndike* (*de ration. finiend. Controverſ. p.* 545, 546.) grants, that the *Greek copies* of theſe books were read and peruſed together with the reſt of the old Teſtament-Canon, and were alluded to in ſeveral paſſages of the Apoſtles writings; ſome of which he there quotes: and ſo were delivered by them, with the reſt of the Canon, to poſterity.—*Eas Apoſtolis lectas, & ad eas alluſum ab Apoſtolis, non eſt, cur dubium ſit*, p. 545. And—*Non poteſt dubium videri, Helleniſtarum codicibus ſcripturas, de quibus nunc diſputamus, contineri ſolitas fuiſſe; Adeo ab ipſis Apoſtolis* (*quos eis uſos fuiſſe, poſita jam ſunt, quæ argumento eſſe debeant*) *certatim eas ſcriptores eccleſiæ*, Scripturarum *nomine appellant.* And, *Ibid. p.* 561. he grants of theſe Books.—*Quod, probati Apoſtolis & Eccleſiæ, ab initio legerentur, propter doctrinam, Prophetarum ſucceſſione acceptam, non Phariſæorum* ἐθελοθρησκεία *in novatam.* Thus He. And, *Ruffinus*, in his ſecond Invective || proving the canonicalneſs and verity of ſome Books called Apocrppha, *the Hiſtory of* Suſanna, and *Hymn of the three children*, from the Apoſtles delivering them to the Church, againſt St. *Jerom* as one, after almoſt four hundred years, denying this, and Judaizing in his opinion, St. *Jerom*, in his latter daies (*impar invidiæ, quam ſibi conflare Ruffinum videbat*; as Mr. *Thorndike* will have it †) return'd this anſwer, *Apolog.* 2.—*Quid autem refero, quid adverſum Suſannæ hiſtoriam, & Hymnum trium puerorum, & Belis Draconis fabulas, quæ in volumine Hebraico non habentur, Hebræas ſoleant dicere, qui me criminatur ſtultum ſe ſycophantam probat: Non enim, quid ipſe ſentirem, ſed quid illi contra nos dicere ſoleant, explicavi.* And ſee ſomething ſaid by this Father to the ſame purpoſe (oppoſing the Churches judgment to that of the Jews) in his Preface to *Tobit.*—*Librum utiq; Tobiæ Hebræi de Catalogo divinarum ſcripturarum ſecantes, his, quæ Hagiographa* [or Apocrypha, if you will] *memorant, manciparunt. Feci ſatis deſiderio veſtro* (in tranſtating it) *non tamen meo ſtudio. Arguunt enim nos Hebræorum ſtudia, & imputant nobis contra ſuum* (he ſaith not, *noſtrum*) *Canonem, latinis auribus iſta tranſferre. Sed melius eſſe judicans Phariſæorum diſplicere judicio, & Epiſcoporum juſſionibus deſervire, inſtiti, ut potui*, &c. And, again, in his preface to *Judith.*—*Apud Hebræos liber Judith inter Hagiographa* (or if you will Apocrypha) *legitur*, &c.—*Sed quia, hunc librum Synodus Nicena in numero S. Scripturarum, legitur, computaſſe, acquievi poſtulationi veſtræ*, &c. To all theſe I grant Biſhop *Coſin* makes replies; || but I think ſuch, as will appear to the Reader, that well weighs them, unſatisfactory, as to the making St. *Jerom* conſtantly maintain, all theſe Books tobe in the ſame manner excluded

|| *Apud Hieron. Tom.* 9.

† *Ibid. p.* 561.

|| See *p.* 81. &c.

excluded from the *Canon* by the *Church*, as they were by the *Jews*.

§. 190. A third inadvertency of the ſame Author ſeems to be, That, from the *Anathema* joyned to their Decree, and from *Pius* his declaration, touching the new Creed he impoſed; —*Hæc eſt Fides, extra quam non eſt ſalus*, the Biſhop argues often, † —*That this Decree is made by this Council no leſs a neceſſary Article of the Chriſtian Faith, than that God is the Creator of Heaven, and Earth; or, that Chriſt was born of the Bleſſed Virgin*, &c. Contrary to which ſee what is ſaid below, §. 192, and 194. *&c.*

† *See in him,* §. 198.

§. 191. A fourth inadvertency of the ſame Biſhop is in reference to that *rule* given by St. *Auſtin*, † for knowing what books are by us to be held *Canonical*, ſet down in his Sect. 81. viz. —*In Canonicis Scripturis Eccleſiarum Catholicarum quamplurium* [but the Biſhop ſets it down, *quamplurimum*] *authoritatem ſequatur.* Which Rule the Biſhop ſeemeth there to approve, and commend, and yet, ſince this *Rule* is no more proper, or applicable, to the Churches Authority, or Guidance of its Subjects, in S. *Auſtins* age, than in any other, precedent, or ſubſequent; from hence it will follow, that the *Biſhop* is to receive theſe Books *now* as *Canonical*, becauſe they are by the *moſt*, and *moſt* dignified Churches of God, received as ſuch; and he knows, that no book is therefore juſtly excluded from the Canon, becauſe it hath been ſometimes heretofore doubted of. Excuſe this digreſſion, by which perhaps you may perceive, that this Biſhop had no juſt cauſe to raiſe ſo great a quarrel, againſt ſo great a Council, out of this matter.]

† *De Doctr. Chriſt. l. 1 c. 8.*

§. 192. 7. That the *contrary* to ſuch Propoſitions, the maintainers whereof are Anathematized, as Hereticks, is not hereby made by the Council an Article of Faith in ſuch a ſence, [1] As if it were made a *Divine Truth*, or a matter, or object, of our Faith; or the contrary Doctrine to it, made againſt *Faith*, or the matter of *Hereſie*, *now*, which was not ſo *formerly*. [2] Or, as if ſuch *Divine Truth* were not alſo revealed, and declared to be ſo formerly, either in the ſame *Expreſsion*, and concluſion, or in its neceſſary *Principles*. [3] Or, as if any ſuch thing were now neceſſary *explicitly* to be known, or believ'd abſolutely, *Ratione Medii*, for attaining *Salvation*, which was not ſo formerly: [4] Or yet, as if there might not be ſuch a *ſufficient propoſal* made to us of ſuch Point formerly, as that, from this, we had then an obligation to believe it: [5] Or yet, as if the ignorance of ſuch point, before the *Definition* of a Council, might not be ſome *loſs* in order to our *ſalvation*, and this our ignorance of it, then alſo, culpable. But, That ſuch Point is made, by the Councils defining it, an *Article*, or

7.

object;

object of our *Faith*, now neceſſary to be believed in ſome degree of *neceſsity* (wherein it was not before) by reaſon of a more *Evident* propoſal thereof, when the *Council* (whoſe judgment we are bound to believe, and ſubmit to) declares it a Divine Truth; or alſo now firſt delivers that point of faith more *expreſly* in the *Concluſion*, which was before involv'd, and known only to the Chriſtian World, in its Principles. By which *evident* Definition of the Council (though the *Doctrine* oppoſing ſuch point of faith was before *Heretical*, or *matter* of Hereſie, yet) the maintainer thereof now firſt by his pertinacy againſt the Churches Authority, begins to be an *Heretick*. † And though the ignorance of ſuch point of faith before might bring ſome damage as to our ſalvation, yet now doth it more, when a *contrary error* begins to corrupt our *practice*. I ſay, ſuch Point begins to be *neceſſary*, in a new Degree of neceſſity, to be believed or aſſented to; or, not to be diſſented from, or denied; or, not the contrary of it to be believ'd, ſo ſoon, as we have had a *ſufficient propoſal* of the Councils defining it. And *neceſſary* it is then to be *believ'd*, not out of an obligation, or duty of *belief* we owe to ſuch a *Credend*, as that, without believing it, we cannot attain ſalvation; but out of the duty of *obedience* we owe to the *Church*, when defining it, as that, without yielding this obedience to Her, we become guilty of ſuch a ſin, as, unrepented of, ruins ſalvation. Eſpecially, when as this our *Holy Mother* doth not enjoyn to us the belief of ſuch a Divine Truth, but upon ſome *conſiderable Motive*: for the repelling and ſuppreſſing of ſome error, that is, (leſs, or more) dangerous; and for the preſervation of ſome part of neceſſary truth, or good life. Concerning which *Propoſals*, the Churches pronouncing Anathema to the non-Submitters ſeems ſecur'd as by ancient practice, ſo by our Lord's order, *Matt.* 18, 17. *He that will not hear the Church, let him be to us as an Heathen*; though, otherwiſe, the pure *neſcience* of ſuch a Doctrine, abſtracting from ſuch Propoſal, harms no man, as to excluſion from ſalvation, any more after the Churches *Definition*; than, before it. See what hath been ſaid of this matter in the third *Diſc.* §. 18.—and § 85. *n.* 6.

† See *Diſc.* 3. §. 18.

§. 193.

Thus (to expreſs, if I can, yet more clearly, though with ſome repetitions, a thing, whereat ſo many of the Reformed, and thoſe not of the meaneſt ſort, ſeem to ſtumble, and take offence) an *Article* of *Faith*, as to a more univerſal *Propoſal* of it, and general obligation to *believe* it ſo ſufficiently propoſed, may be ſaid *new*: and then, in reſpect of this *new* Declaration, and Obligation, a Divine Truth may be an Article, or object of my Faith, to day, which was not yeſterday: So he, who, (by what means ſo ever) knows now, that ſomething is ſaid in *Scripture*, which he

knew

knew not yesterday, may be said to have to day a new Article of his Faith; or a new point, no way to be opposed, or condemne but assented to, and believed, by him.

When, therefore, a thing is said to be no *Dogma Fidei* before, and at such a time to begin to be so, the meaning is, ; either, that in such *expres* terms it is so *now*, as it was not *formerly* (by some fuller explication, or new Deduction:) Or, that it is now rendred necessary to be believed by *all* persons, by whom it was not so formerly, for want, then, of so *evident* a proposal. Again, when a Point is said thus to be rendred by the Definition of a Council necessary to be believed, which was not so formerly: It is meant; *necessary to be believed*; not, for the matter thereof. Either, 1st, As if the actual knowledge, and faith thereof were absolutely necessary to salvation, at all; or now, more then formerly. For thus a few points only (some think, not all those of the Apostles Creed) are necessary; and nothing *is*, thus, necessary at any time, that is not so alwaies. Or, 2ly, As if the actual knowledge thereof is beneficial to our salvation now, and was not so at all formerly. For, as it is now perhaps beneficial in more respects; so, in some respects, was it alwaies; and therefore if we knew it not before, so much imperfection there was then in our faith, as to something revealed; though, not a deficiency thereof in absolutely necessaries. But, *necessary to be believed* now more, than formerly, *ex accidenti*; because, 1st, we have a sufficient *Proposal* thereof, by the *Church-Definition*, now, that it is a divine Truth: which Proposal perhaps we had not before in so expres terms, and so universally discovered by the former Tradition: and, 2ly. Because we have also a sufficient proposal, or notice, that such a Definition hath been made by the Church. And so, in not believing it, we are now defective in our *obedience*, and *acceptance* of some *divine Truth*, which is made known to us by the Church, as some way *profitable* to our *salvation*; some way advantagious to God's *Glory*; some way conducible to *Christian Edification*, to the *peace* of the Church, and suppression of *Heresie*, or, to some other good end. By whose Definitions from time to time the Rule of our faith is made still *more compleat*, and *conspicuous*, both as to the registring, and solemn inrolling of her former Traditions: and as to the expres knowledge of several Consequences necessarily issuing from the former Principles of the Christian Belief: *more compleat*, I say, to the end of the world, as to several points, in some respect, or other, beneficial to be known: Though, from the first, the *Christian Faith* was ever *perfect*, as to any knowledge simply necessary; or also, as to all that were fundamentally useful,

useful. And therefore the chief Duty, that the Church now requires to many of her Decisions made from time to time, as counter-works against Hereticks, and extracted alwaies out of the former Materials of Original Traditions, is not so much an actual knowing of them for every Christian (though this also she desires, as esteeming the knowledge of them some way contributing to Christian perfection;) but, that they be not *dissented* from, or *opposed*, when made known to him; and that the *Contradictory* of them be not believed by Him.

As for the *profession* of the *Roman* faith required in the Bull of *Pius*, wherein are said to be 12. new Articles added to the Apostolical: I wonder why they say not 12. score, or a 1200. rather, for if it adds any, it adds *omnia à S. Tridentinâ Synodo, & ab Oecumenicis Conciliis, & à sacris Canonibus tradita, definita & declarata*, as it runs in the same Bull, though it expresseth only some few of them. §. 194.

1st. All the order that the Council of *Trent* gave concerning this *Profession* of *Faith*, was;—*Sess* 24. *de Refor. cap.* 12. —*Provisi etiam de beneficiis, teneantur Orthodoxæ suæ fidei, publicam facere professionem; & in Romanæ Ecclesiæ obedientiâ se permansuros spondeant.* So that, *Hæc est Catholica fides, extra quam nemo salvus*, is a Declaration of the *Pope*, not of the *Council*; nor can it have any more authority, than other *Papal* Decrees. 1.

2. And again, what ever profession of faith is made in that Bull; or, if it oblige further, therein, than the *Canons* of the Councils do bind; yet it concerneth not any persons, save those who enter into religious Orders, or into some Ecclesiastical Benefice, as appears in the Preface. 2.

3. These persons are not therein obliged to believe the *Articles*, or *Canons* of *Trent*, or, of other Councils in any other sense, than that, which we have but now mentioned. † For that *Clause* in the Bull which follows the whole profession.—*Hæc vera Catholica fides, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest*, cannot be understood *distributively*, in such a manner, as if every Canon of every lawful Council is necessary *explicitly* to be known, and assented to, that any one may attain *Salvation*; which few Roman Doctors will affirm of all the Articles of the Apostles Creed; much less do they say it of every point whatever of their faith. (See *Bellarmin de Eccles. l.* 3. *c.* 14.—*Multa sunt de fide, quæ non sunt absolutè necessaria ad salutem*; I add, nor yet is the ignorance or mistaking in some of them such an error, *ex quo magnum aliquod malum oriatur.*) But either * it is to be understood *collectively*, *In hac Professione continetur vera Catholica Fides*, &c. that all the *fides, extra quam nemo salvus*, is contained in that profession: (which expression re- §. 195. *n.* 13. 3. † §. 192.

spects

ſpects chiefly the *Apoſtles*, or *Nicen*, Creed, ſet in the front of the profeſſion; as appears by a like expreſſion [*Fundamentum firmum & unicum*] applied to that Creed alone, in *Conc. Trident. 3d. Seſſ.*) For, if only ſome part of that profeſſion of faith, which is made in that Bull, be abſolutely neceſſary to attaining Salvation, this phraſe is ſufficiently juſtified, *extra quam* [*i. e. totam, i. e.* if all parts of it be diſbelieved] *non eſt ſalus.* As ſaying; [that the Holy *Scriptures* are the *word of God*, without believing which there is no Salvation,] argues not, that *every* thing delivered in theſe Scriptures, is neceſſary to be believed for Salvation, but that *ſome* things are. Or, * It is to be underſtood *diſtributively*, but this *conditionally*; in ſuch a ſence, as, *extra quam nemo ſalvus eſſe poteſt. i. e.* if ſuch perſon oppoſeth, or denieth aſſent to, any point therein, when ſufficiently evidenced to him to be a *Definition* of the *Church* infallibly aſſiſted, and appointed his Guide in Divine Truths. † For in ſo doing, though the error ſhould be in a ſmaller matter of faith, he becomes therein obſtinate, and Heretical, and diſobedient to his ſpiritual Guide, declared by the Scriptures infallible in all neceſſaries: and ſo, in this, becomes guilty of a *mortal ſin*: which unrepented of, exlcudes from Salvation. Where alſo, ſince the Church makes Definitions in points abſolutely *neceſſary*; hence though all her Definitions are not in ſuch, yet his *obſtinacy*, in not yielding aſſent to all matters defined, runs a hazzard of failing in ſomething *neceſſary*.

† See before §. 192.

§. 195. n. 2. [And well may *Proteſtants* admit ſuch a ſence of theſe words in *Pius* his *Bull*, when themſelves make uſe of a much *larger* upon the like words in the *Athanaſian* Creed: [*Hæc eſt Fides Catholica, quam niſi quiſq; fideliter crediderit, ſalvus eſſe non poterit.*] which words being urged by a Catholik againſt Archbiſhop *Laud* to ſhew: That ſome Points may become neceſſary, for ſalvation, to be believed, when once *defined* by the Church, that yet are not abſolutely ſo neceſſary, or fundamental, according to the Importance of the *matter*: All the points contained in the Creed being not held in this latter ſence ſo fundamental, or neceſſary, *ratione Medii*, to Salvation, that none can poſſibly attain it without an explicit belief of them: Here a late Proteſtant Writer, † in anſwer to this, can find out a ſence of thoſe words yet more remiſs, than that we have now given, *viz.* That, as to ſome of the Athanaſian Articles, [*Hæc eſt fides Cathol.* &c.] neither infers, that they are neceſſary to be believed from the *matter*; nor yet from *Church-Definition*: but neceſſary only, if there be firſt a *clear conviction* (*i. e.* not from Church-Authority, but from Scripture) that they are *Divine Revelation*. Where the authority of the Church,

† *Stillingf.* P. 70, 71.

in

in defining theſe matters of the *Athanaſian* Creed, as to any obligation of her Subjects to conform to it, ſeems quite laid aſide: ſince upon a *clear conviction*, that thoſe Articles are Divine Revelation, from whatever Proponent, one ſtands obliged to believe them; and, without ſuch *conviction*, neither ſtands he ſo obliged by the Church. Upon which account the Socinian is freed here by his expoſition, from the—*Quam niſi quiſque fideliter*, &c. becauſe he is not yet *convinced* of the *Truth* of this faith by Scripture. Since Proteſtants, then, take ſuch liberty in expounding the ſence of this concluſion of the Athanaſian Articles, it is but reaſon, that they ſhould allow the ſame to the ſame words uſed by *Pius*.]

§. 196. 4. Laſtly. If theſe words of *Pius* ſhould be taken in ſuch a ſence, as Proteſtants fetter them with: Namely,—*That the Roman Church hereby obtrudes her new-coined Articles, as abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation*: As Biſhop *Bramhal*. † *Which, whether true or falſe, one is to ſwear to, as much as to his Creed*: As Mr. Thorndike.† *That, whereas the Church of* England *only excommunicates ſuch, as ſhall affirm, that her Articles are in any part erroneous, the ſame Church never declaring, that every one of her Articles are fundamental in the Faith, by the Church of* Rome *every one of them, if that Church hath once determined them, is made fundamental, and that in every part of it, to all mens belief*: As Biſhop *Laud*; ‖ *That ſuppoſing the Churches Definition* [once paſſed] *that thing ſo propounded becomes as neceſſary to ſalvation* [*i. e.* by this Propoſal, or Definition] as *what is neceſſary from the matter*; And —*That an equal explicit faith is required to the Definitions of the Church, as to the Articles of the Creed: and that there is an* equal *neceſſity, in order to ſalvation, of believing both of them*: As Mr. *Stillingf.*† If, I ſay, *Pius* his [*Hæc eſt Fides Catholica*] muſt be taken in ſuch a ſence: and then, it be conſidered alſo; that, by the Bull, this clauſe is applied not only to the *Articles* expreſly mentioned in it, but to all *other Definitions* alſo of all other *former* allowed Councils, the Conſequent is; that in this Bull the Pope hath excluded from ſalvation, and that for want of neceſſary faith, the far greater part not only of Chriſtians, but of Roman Catholicks; *viz.* all, that do not explicitly believe, and therefore, that do not actually know, *every* particular Definition of *any* precedent Council; when as, who is there among the *vulgar*, that is not ignorant of the *moſt* of them? who amongſt the *learned*, that knows them *all*? Now the very abſurdity of ſuch a Tenent might make them ſuſpect the integrity of their comment on thoſe words; and, that they only declaim againſt their own Fancies. When as indeed; to render any Point, after defined, neceſſary explicitly to be believed, not only, this one condition, of the Churches

† *Rep.* to *Chalced. p.* 322.
† *Epilog. Concluſ. p.* 410.
‖ §. 15. *p.* 51.
† *Rat. Account, p.* 48.

having defined them, is required (for none is obliged neceſſarily to believe *explicitly*, whatever the Church hath defined) but a ſecond alſo, of a ſufficient *propoſal*, made to us, of the Churches having defined them. And then indeed, ſo many Articles are neceſſary to be explicitly believed, as to the doing of our *duty* in order to our ſalvation, but not all of them neceſſary to be believed, as to acquiring ſome *knowledge* neceſſary to our ſalvation, without which knowledge it could not be had, as that of ſome of the Articles of the Creed is. See what hath been already ſaid of this whole matter much what to this purpoſe, in *Diſc.* 3. §. 85. *n.* 4. &c.

§. 197. There are, then (as Catholicks, to undeceive Proteſtants, do frequently inculcat, and cannot be heard) *Points*, or *Articles* of *Faith* neceſſary to our *Salvation* to be believed; or, *extra quæ credita nemo ſalvus*; in a tripple ſence. 1. Some neceſſary *ratione Medii*: Such as are neceſſary ſo abſolutely, as that an invincible ignorance of them is ſaid to fail of Salvation; which are a very *few* of the many Articles of our Chriſtian Faith. 2. Others neceſſary *ratione præcepti*: which are neceſſary to be believed, only *conditionally*: And they are of two ſorts. 1. Either *ſuch*, which I am not only obliged to *believe*, when known to me to be Divine Truths, but the *knowledge* alſo of which, as Articles of high concernment, I am bound, according to the different quality of my condition to ſeek after, wherein my *ignorance* and *neglect*, when by uſing a due diligence I might have known them, being thus in an high degree culpable, doth, unrepented of, deſtroy my *ſalvation*. Such are ſome other chief Principles of Religion and Piety, the ten Commandements, and ſome Sacraments, *&c.* delivered in the common Creeds, and Catechiſms, ſuch as are not abſolutely neceſſary, *ratione Medii*.

3. 3. 2. Or *ſuch*, as though I am not obliged to ſuch, a diligent *ſearch* of them, as of the former, yet a *belief* of them I am to embrace ſo often, as theſe two things precede. 1ſt. that they are defined by my ſpiritual Guides to be Divine Revelation, &c, 2ly. that this Definition is ſufficiently evidenced to me. Where, though not my meer ignorance in ſuch Points, yet my denial or diſ-belief of them thus propoſed, is to be judged wilful, and obſtinate; and this, unrepented of, deſtroyes my ſalvation.

§. 198. 8. 8. This of the Seventh; The Eighth conſideration is: That the *moſt*, or *chiefeſt* of the Proteſtant Controverſies, defined, or made, *de Fide*, in the *Council* of *Trent* (to repeat here what hath been ſaid formerly in the firſt *Diſc.* §. 50.) were made ſo by *former Councils* of equal obligation: or alſo were contained in the publick *Liturgies* of the Church Catholick, — As: *The law-*

fulneſs,

fulneſs of *communion in one kind*, declared in the Council of *Conſtance*. *Canon of Scripture*; *Purgatory*; *ſeven Sacraments*, *the Popes Supremacy*; in the Council of *Florence*. *Auricular Confeſſion*; *Tranſubſtantiation*; in the Council *Lateran*, *Veneration of Images*, in ſecond *Nicene* Council.—*Adoration of Chriſts Body and Blood as preſent in the Euchariſt*, in the Council of *Frankfort* (if Capitulare Caroli may be taken to deliver the ſence of that Council. †) *Veneration of the Croſs*, † *and of Relicks*, ‖ in the ſame Council [only this Council condemned *the Adoration of Images* in ſuch a ſence, as they miſtook the ſecond Council of *Nice* to have allowed it †] *Monaſtick vows*; *Celibacy of Clergy*, ſufficiently authorized in the four firſt General Councils. *Invocation of Saints*, *Prayer for the Dead*, *Sacrifice of the Maſs*; and many other, apparent in the publick *Liturgies* of the Church, preceding the Council of *Trent*, and unaltered for many ages (Proteſtants being Judges.) Now the Church obligeth her Subjects to *believe* all thoſe things *lawful*, which in her Liturgies, ſhe obligeth them to *practiſe*: And, why was there made a departure from the Church for theſe points, before the Council of *Trent*, if the Church before made them not, *de Fide*, or if the Council of *Trent*, or *Pius* the 4th, were firſt faulty, herein? But if *Councils*, before *Trent*, have defined ſuch things, then by *theſe* firſt were all hopes of peace, except by yielding to their Decrees, cut off, and not by *Trent*; becauſe theſe Councils are by the Roman Church accepted, and held obligatory, as well as that of *Trent*. And here I may repeat thoſe words of Biſhop *Bramhal* (recited in *Diſc.* 1. §. 52.) in anſwer to the Biſhop of *Chalcedon*, who urged the *ſeparation* of Proteſtants from the Church, long before the *Grievances* of *Trent*, or *Pius*.—*Theſe very Points* (ſaith he †) *which* Pius *the Fourth comprehended in a new Symbol, or Creed, were obtruded on us before by his Predeceſſors* [*i. e.* then, when *Luther* and his Followers forſook the Church] *as neceſſary Articles of the Roman Faith*; *and required, as neceſſary Articles of their Communion*: —*This is the only difference, that* Pius 4. *dealt in groſs, his Predeceſſors by retail. They faſhioned the ſeveral rods, and he bound them up into a bundle. They faſhioned the rods, i. e.* in the Synods held in the Church, before *Luthers* appearance. For theſe Rods only require ſubmittance, as being *neceſſary Articles of her Communion*; and ſuch are only the Definitions of her Councils.

† See *Capitulare. l. 2. c. 5.—c. 27.*
† *Ib. l. 4. c. 16.*
‖ *Ib. l. 3. c. 24.*
† See *Capitulare præfat.*—Dr. *Hammond of Idol.* § 57.—*Thornd. Epilog. l. 3 p.* 363.
† *p.* 263.

9. *Conſid.* That the *Proteſtants*, who accuſe, ſeem as guilty in making *new definitions* in matters of faith, and enjoyning them to be *believed*, or *aſſented*, and ſubſcribed to, by thoſe of their Communion, as the Council of *Trent*, or Roman Church, that is here taxed for it. For, as the one is ſaid to make new *affirmatives* in Religion,

§ 199. 9.

so the other, new *Negatives*; all, or most of which (as hath been
† §. 85 n. 2. shewed in the 3d. *Disc. c.* 7. †) are *implicitly* new affirmatives. Neither can the *Church* of *Rome* be more justly questioned in her not
§. 200. leaving points in *universals* only, and their former indifference; but anew-stating *Purgatory*, *Transubstantiation*, *Invocation*, &c. than the *Reformed*, and particularly those of the English Church for new-stating the *contrary* to these. 1. Who (as hath been
† §. 85. n. 3. shewed, in the 3d *Disc. c.* 7. †) 1. do not *suspend* their judgment concerning those *new points*, which, they say, the Roman Church presumes to determine, but do, in the main Articles handled in the Council of *Trent*, as peremptorily state the one side, as the *Roman Church*, the other: and, as to several points, the reformed also were the *first*, I mean in comparison of the Council of *Trent*, in *determining* them; and condemning the doctrines and practises of the other side. So (to say nothing here of the *Augustan Confession*, composed many years before the sitting of this *Council*, and condemning most of the points; which this justifies) *the Sacrifice of the Mass*, *Communion in one kind*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Veneration of Images*, *Purgatory*, *Indulgences*, and some others were condemned and declared to be against Gods Word by the *Articles* of the *Church* of *England* many years, before the same were either imposed to be sworn to by *Pius*, or defended, and justified by the *Articles* of *Trent*; the one done in 1549. the other in 1562. 2. 2ly. Who leave as little *liberty* to their Subjects to hold the Roman tenents, as the Roman Church doth, to hold theirs. For as the *Roman* Church doth *Anathematize* those, who affirm the contrary to her Articles, to be true, so doth the *Church* of *England*, in the Synod held under King *James*, 1603. *can.* 5. *excommunicate* those, that affirm any of her *Articles* to be *erroneous*: And for this Churches requiring also not only an external *non-contradiction*, but internal *assent*,
§. 83. n. 1. I desire you to weigh the proofs produced in the 3d. *Disc. c.* 7. † whither, to avoid Repetitions, I remit you.

And, if we look into the Protestant Churches abroad, we find the *National Synod* of *Dort*, assembled, *A. D.* 1618. touching some differences among their Divines in those high, and dark points of *Divine Predestination*; Co-operation of *Grace*, and *Freewill*, &c. where were present also some Divines sent from all the other Protestant Churches following the Doctrine of *Calvin* (except the *French*). We find it, I say, in those five Points, * to have passed, partly in asserting *Truths*, partly in condemning *errors*, no less than 91. *Articles*, or *Canons*. (What might their Canons have amounted to; had they discussed so many Points of Controversie, as that of *Trent* did?) And then, * to enjoyn all the Pastors their Subjects

Subjects the teaching to the people of these Truths [and therefore the believing of them;] and * to excommunicate all those holding the contrary, as corrupters of the Truth, till they shall give satisfaction to the Church, in professing the true Doctrines. The words of the Synod, *Sess.* 138. are these.—*Synodus hæc Dordrechtana, pro authoritate, quam ex Dei verbo in omnia Ecclesiarum suarum membra obtinet in Christi nomine injungit omnibus, & singulis in Fœderato Belgio Ecclesiarum Pastoribus,* &c. *ut hanc sacram veritatis salutaris doctrinam* [*viz.* that delivered in the 91. Articles concerning the five Points in Controversie] *sinceram & inviolatam, conservent; illam populo & juventuti fideliter proponant, & explicent,* &c. [which publick teaching of them, required, includes assent to them.] Then against the *Remonstrants* pronounceth thus—*Synodus, suæ Authoritatis ex verbo Dei probe conscia, omnium legitimarum tum veterum, tum recentiorum, Synodorum vestigiis insistens, declarat, atq; judicat, Pastores illos*, &c. [the Remonstrant Ministers] *corruptæ Religionis, & scissæ Ecclesiæ unitatis reos teneri. Quas ob causas, Synodus prædictis, omni ecclesiastico munere, interdicit, eisq; ab officiis suis abdicat, donec per seriam resipiscentiam dictis, factis, studiis contrariis, comprobatam, Ecclesiæ satisfaciant, atq; ad ejus communionem recipiantur.* Then orders,—*Ut Synodi Provinciales neminem ad sacrum Ministerium admittant, qui doctrinæ, hisce Synodicis constitutionibus declaratæ, subscribere, eamq; docere, recuset.*

§. 201. Only this main *difference* there is between these two Churches: That the one requires *assent* to her Articles, telling her Subjects, that in *necessaries* she cannot erre: the other requires *assent*, declaring to her followers that she may erre, even in points Necessary: The one requires *assent* in obedience to her *Authority*, delegated to her by our Lord: the other seems to require *assent* only from the *Evidence* (in *Scripture*, or otherwise) of the *matter* proposed, Therefore so many of her Subjects, as see not such *Evidence*, in equity, me thinks, should be freed from her exacting their *assent*. And then, such obligation to assent would fail of its end, expressed before her Articles, *viz.*—*the hindering diversity of Opinions, and the establishing of consent touching true Religion.*

§. 202. 10. Lastly, to shut up all; Whatever *offence*, either this strict *Profession* of *Faith* summ'd up by *Pius*, or *Anathemas* multiplied by the Council of *Trent*, may have given to the Reformed; yet neither the one, nor the other, can justly be charged to have given *occasion* to their *discession*, and *rent* from the former *Catholick Church*. Which Division, and (as I have shewed †) their Censure † §. 200. also of the Roman Doctrines, preceded both the times of *Pius*, and the sitting of this Council: and, on the contrary, their *Departure*, and

and such *Censure*, first occasioned the Churches standing upon her *Defence*, and the setting up these new *fences* and *Bars*, for preservation of her ancient Doctrine invaded by them, and for hindering her sheep from straging out of her fold, and hearkning after the voice of Strangers.

CHAP. XII.

V. Head. *Of the Decrees of this Council concerning Reformation.*

1. *In matters, concerning the Pope and Court of* Rome. §. 207.
   1. *Appeales*, §. 212. *and Dispensations*, §. 215. 2. *Collation of Benefices*, §. 218. 3. *Pensions* §. 218 *Commenda's*, §. 219. *and uniting of Benefices*, 220. 4. *Exemptions*, §. 221. 5. *Abuses concerning Indulgences, and Charities given to Pious uses*, §. 223.
2. *In matters concerning the Clergy.* §. 209.
   1. *Unfit persons many times admitted into H. Orders, and Benefices*, §. 225. 2. *Pluralities*, §. 232. 3. *Non-Residence*, §. 235. 4 *Neglect of Preaching and Catechising*, §. 236. *And the Divine Service not in the vulgar tongue*, §. 236. *n.* 2. 5. *Their restraint from* Marriage; *and Incontinency in Celibacy*, §. 238, 239. 6. *Their with-holding from the people the Communion of the Cup*, §. 241. 7. *Too frequent use of Excommunication*, §. 243. *n.* 1. 8. *The many disorders in Regulars and Monasticks*, §. 243. *n.* 2. 9. *Several defects in the Missals and Breviaries*, §. 243. *n.* 3.

§. 203 THus much (from, §. 173.) of the 4*th.* Head: Concerning the *multitude* of the *Canons*, *Definitions*, and *Anathemas*, of this Council, in points of Doctrine. The fifth succeeds; touching the Acts for *Reformation* of several corruptions, and disorders in the Churches Government, and Discipline; which was so much petitioned for by Christian Princes; and also, from its first sitting, undertaken by this Council; But, *with such a contrary, and unexpected issue* (*saith* Soave †) *That this Council, being managed by Princes for Reformation of Ecclesiastical Discipline, hath caused*

† *l.* 1. *p.* 2.

the

the greateſt Deformation, that ever was ſince Chriſtianity did begin; and, hoped for by the Biſhops to regain the Epiſcopal Authority, uſurped for the moſt part by the Pope, hath made them loſe it altogether, bringing them into greater ſervitude; on the contrary, feared and avoided by the See of Rome, *as a potent means to moderat the exorbitant power, mounted from ſmall beginnings, by divers degrees, unto an unlimited exceſs, it hath ſo eſtabliſhed, and confirmed the ſame over that part, which remaineth ſubject unto it, that it was never ſo great, nor ſo ſoundly rooted.* Thus he. To which may be added the like paſſage in Mr. *Stillingfleet*, † I ſuppoſe, from this Hiſtorians Detractions too confidently followed, who tells his Readers,—*That the Pope was ſtill in a bodily Fear, till the Council was ended to his mind; But then, what rejoycing, that they had cheated the world ſo, that that which was intended to clip the wings of the Court of* Rome, *had confirmed, and advanced the Intereſt of it!*

† *Rat. Acc ount, p.* 480.

§. 204.

But I ſuppoſe, it will be ſufficient, in anſwer to both, to give you the Confeſſions of the ſame *Soave*, in the latter end of his Hiſtory, to make appear, how untruly theſe things are ſaid, in the beginning. For, after the Council now ended, and a Confirmation deſired from the Pope of theſe its acts, the authority of Biſhops was found to be ſo much enlarged by the Council; and the former exerciſe of the Popes Authority (though all done with a *Salva authoritate Apoſtolica ſedis*) ſo much pared; the privileges of the Cardinals, and gains of the Court of *Rome*, by the reſtraints of Appeals, of Diſpenſations, of Pluralities, of Non-Reſidence, Exemptions, Penſions, Elections, *&c.* ſo much diminiſhed, that the Pope, (though of himſelf much inclined to a General *Confirmation*,) with his Cardinals, and Court, is related by *Soave*, to have, long time, deliberated: whether the Articles *of Faith* only ſhould be accepted, and confirmed; and thoſe *of Reformation* rejected, or moderated.

To give you theſe things rather in his own words; which may ſerve as an Antidote to the former. *L.* 8. *p.* 814. He ſaith, —*That the Court, underſtanding that the Pope was reſolved for the Confirmation, changed their joy into grief; and all the Officers complained of the loſs they ſhould receive in their Offices, if that reformation were executed.*—*That Supplications alſo, and Memorials, were given to the Pope by thoſe, who, having bought their Offices, and foreſeing this loſs, demanded Reſtitution.*—*That the Pope, having diligently conſidered hereof, deputed eight Cardinals to conſult upon the Confirmation; and to think upon ſome remedy for the complaints of the Court.*—*That theſe Cardinals were almoſt all of opinion, that it was fit they ſhould be moderated before the Confirmation.*—*And that it was certain,*

certain, that they, who did procure the Council, had no aim but to pull down the Popes authority; and, while the Council did last, every one did speak, as if It had power to give laws unto him, [where you see what freedom the Council took]—*At last, that, satisfied with two speeches, the one of Cardinal* Amulius, *the other of* Hugo Buon Compagno, *perswading him, and the Court; that, by dispensing with its acts, or giving what interpretations to them he pleased, he might provide for his Ministers, and Servants, and accommodate things to that which might be for the benefit of the Church, without violating the Decrees of the Council, because in them the Apostolick authority is still reserved, the Pope proceeded to confirm them entirely.*

§. 205 To verifie some part of which Relation of *Soave* concerning the reluctance of the Popes Court (not without great cause, if an eye may be had only to gain,) I may add, what *Pallavicino*, writing but the other day, and well acquainted with the present state thereof, relates concerning it †—*That, as to* Favours, *and* Dispensations, *formerly granted from the Apostolick See, this Council hath so far moderated the use of them, that, if the Pope will observe these laws, the fountain of his beneficence is dried up, for one half: And, that, although he hath still a power to dispense with these laws, yet the Popes, for their Conscience, and Honour sake, require for the most part such pressing Motives, and so rarely happening, of doing this, that their Concessions in such matters, as are prohibited by the Council, do not amount to the 20th part of those formerly accustomed. And, that the same thing also happens,* * *in the* Causes, primæ instantiæ (as they phrase it) *that are brought to the Court of* Rome: *And,* * *In those* priviledges, *or exemptions, by which many particular persons withdrew themselves from the Jurisdiction of Bishops; which was no less, than rendring many the immediate Subjects of the Tribunals of the Pope; and finally,* * *in all those affairs, concerning which the Council grants power to the Bishops, that they shall proceed in them, as* Delegats of the Apostolick See; *which, as to the advancing of the Bishops power, amounts to the same, as if they dispatched them* [in their own right] *without any such formality.* Thus he. And again. *l. 23. c. 12. n. 5.* To *Soave*, † objecting: That the leaving the cognition, and termination of several causes to the Bishops Tribunals without any more Appeales to *Rome*, ordered in the 20th Chapter of Reformation, *Sess. 24.* was quite destroyed, by the exception there added.—*Ab his excipiantur causæ—quæ exurgent rationabiliq; causâ, judicaverit summus Romanus Pontifex, per speciale Rescriptum Signaturæ sanctitatis suæ manu propria subscribendum, committere, aut avocare:* he answers thus, —*That, though the Pope may still call to himself, what causes he thinks*

Introduct. c. 10.

l. 8. p. 792.

fit,

ſit, ſo he paſſeth this firſt, under his own hand, and ſeal; yet, that the former faculty of his Officers to call ſuch cauſes to him, though in his name, yet without his knowledge, or ſubſcription, was now ceaſed by this new Order; —And *That*, if it be numbred (as that is eaſily counted which is ſeldom done) How many Commiſſions, of this kind, are ſigned by the Pope in a year for the whole Circuite of Chriſtianity, if theſe riſe to three or four yearly, it is acknowledged very much. Thus he, of the former Income to the Court of *Rome* much diminiſhed: and, of the Acts of this Council, after the decurrence of an hundred years, as to this matter, ſtill retaining their primitive vigour; publiſhing theſe things in that place, where, in matters ſo obvious, and evident, his credit muſt ſuffer very much by any falſification. But, on the other ſide, the Epiſcopal authority, in this Council, was ſo much increaſed by the Popes, and the Councils committing many both perſons, and affairs, before exempt, and reſerved, to their inſpection, and Government, (as which Biſhops, being at a nearer diſtance, could better diſcern and attend them) that the King of *Spain* ſaid of his —*That they went to the Council as ſo many Pariſh Prieſts; but returned from it ſo many Popes.*

§. 206

Next the Decrees themſelves concerning Reformation (which in a few hours you may read deliberately over; and where eſpecially I would recommend to you the view of thoſe made under *Pius*; and, amongſt theſe, thoſe chiefly of the 24th *Seſſion.*) I ſay, the Decrees themſelves do ſhew the great ſervice, which this Council hath done to the Church, at that time much relaxed, and languiſhing in its *Diſcipline*, partly by reaſon of its non-execution of former neceſſary Church-Canons, partly by other abuſes, not provided againſt by any former laws, and now growing intolerable. In all which matters a much better face of Eccleſiaſtical affairs appears at preſent, through the Influence, which this Council hath had upon the ſucceeding times. And much have thoſe ungrateful Detractors to anſwer to God, by whom the *Good* of this great Body of the moſt ſacred of Magiſtrates hath been, not only ſo little acknowledged, but ſo *evil ſpoken of.*

§. 207.

It would be too tedious to recite to you all the particular Acts of this Council, wherein it hath repaired the former decayes: but perhaps not unneceſſary, in ſuch an ungrateful age, to relate, and clear ſome of the chiefeſt.

The manners, and cuſtoms of the Church, that chiefly in thoſe times were imagined to give cauſe of juſt complaint, ſeem to be,

§.207. 1ſt. Concerning the *Pope*, and *Court of* Rome. 1. *α.* The Avocation of ſo many *Cauſes*, and admiſſion of ſo many *Appeales* (without aſcent, as formerly, through inferior Courts; eſpecially thoſe of Dioceſan, and Provincial, Synods). *β.* And the reſervation of ſo many Licences, and *Diſpenſations*, to the Apoſtolick See, and Court of *Rome*; Theſe not to be proſecuted, or procured, without great charge; Nor the Judge, at ſo great a diſtance, capable of ſo true, and exact informations, either touching the perſon, or cauſe. 2. *γ.* The Popes *Collation* of *Biſhopricks*, and other *ſpiritual Benefices* in forraine States, where the Merits of ſuch perſons, as are moſt fit, and capable of them, are little known to him. 3. *δ.* The impoſing of *Penſions* on ſuch ſpiritaul Benefices. *ε.* or giving themin *Commenda*; *ζ.* Or *uniting many* of them into one without any neceſſity; So to furniſh Favourites with a ſuperfluous wealth; and hidden Pluralities. 4. *η.* The *Exemptions* of ſo many perſons, and Societies, from Epiſcopal Juriſdictions, which Biſhops, by their vicinity of Reſidence, are the fitteſt rectifiers of all diſorders. 5. *θ* Several abuſes committed by the Perſons publiſhing *Indulgences*, and collecting the *Charities* of Chriſtians for pious uſes.

§.208 I name not here, amongſt theſe Grievances, the Popes *Annats* (in lieu of the Tenths of Tithes) or other conſtant ſupports received from the inferior Clergy out of the ſeveral States of the Weſterne Church, becauſe it neither ſeemed juſt to the Council to deprive him of them; nor, to the Secular Princes, in their many *Articles* of *Reformation* propoſed, to requeſt it. (See thoſe of the Emperor, *Soave*, p. 513. of the King of *France*, p. 652.) as they well ſeeing, that it was neceſſary for this General Father of the Church, both to have, wherewith to maintain ſo many Officers in his ſervice whether at home, or abroad, as the Church affairs, paſſing through his hands, required; and, wherewith alſo to reward their pains. And if the ancient Biſhops of *Rome* manag'd theſe great affairs with a much ſmaller Revenue; yet it muſt be granted; 1. Both that much leſs was then neceſſary, by reaſon as well of the much narrower extent of *Chriſtendome*; as alſo of the union of moſt of it, in thoſe times, under one Secular Power, the Emperour; whereas now the preſervation of the unity of Catholick Faith, and neceſſary correſpondence between the Members of this Church ſo much more diffuſed, and reſiding in ſo many States of a contrary temper, gives much more trouble and charge to the ſupream Head thereof. And, 2ly, Muſt be granted alſo; That, by the want, then, of the preſent ſubſiſtence, whilſt the Pope was the Emperors temporal Subject, both many

many inconveniences, and injuries were ſuffered, and many Benefactions hindered.] This of the Complaints concerning the Pope and his Court.

2. Concerning the *Clergy*. 1. κ. *unfit* perſons elected into *Biſhopricks*, and other Eccleſiaſtical *Benefices*, without a ſufficient pre-examination of their learning and manners. 2. λ. *Pluralities* of *Benefices*; where theſe, ſingly, afford a maintenance ſufficient, whilſt other worthy perſons are deſtitute; and the miſexpence of ſuch ample Church-Revenue on their Secular Relations. 3. μ. *Non-Reſidence*, where having the care, or charge, of ſouls. 4. ν In their Reſidence, *Neglect* of frequent *Preaching*, and Catechiſing. And, Their not celebrating, at leaſt, part of the Divine Service, nor teaching the ignorant the Myſteries of Religion, in the *vulgar tongue*. ο 5. ξ. Their being reſtrained from *marriage*, and, in *Celibacy*, their frequent incontinency, and violation of Chaſtity. 6. π Their withholding the *Communion* of the *Cup* both from the Laity, and themſelves, when not officiating. 7. ρ. Their too common uſe of *Excommunication*; applying many times the ſevereſt of the Churches Cenſures to the ſmalleſt Delinquencies. 8. σ. To which may be added, the many diſorders, then obſerved, in *Regulars* and *Monaſticks*. 9. τ. The correction neceſſary of ſeveral things in the *Miſſals*, and *Breviaries*; and bringing them to a greater uniformity. §. 209. κ. λ. μ. ν. ξ. π. ρ. σ. τ.

Concerning theſe, and ſeveral other grievances, ſee the Articles of Reformation propoſed by the Emperors Agents, before the 21. and 24. Seſſions, in *Soave*, p. 513, and 751, and by the French, before the 23. Seſſion, in *Soave*, 652.. Theſe therefore the Council took into due conſideration; and rectified what they judged amiſs, * ſo far, as that Iron-age would permit: (of which the Council thus complains, *Seſſ. 25. De Reform. Regul. c. 21. Adeo dura, difficiliuq; eſt præſentium temporum conditio, ut nec ſtatim omnibus, nec commune, ubiq; quod optaret, remedium poſſet adhiberi*:) and, * ſo far, as the National parties in the Council, inured to ſeveral cuſtomes, and injoying different priviledges, without the making of a ſchiſme, could agree upon: rectified, I ſay, ſo far, as their Ordinations, ſtrengthened with ſevere penalties, could do it: But the conſtant execution of theſe depends on others, whoſe diligence, or ſupineneſs herein muſt needs produce, in the Church, contrary effects; and alſo the neceſſity of leaving their Canons, upon juſt occaſions, (all which no law can fit,) *diſpenſable*, muſt alſo leave open a paſſage to ſuch Governours, as are corrupt, or negligent, of doing this without a reaſonable cauſe. §. 210.

§. 211. 1ſt. Then, for thoſe matters that concern the *Pope*, and *Court* of *Rome*: See the many Decrees in this Council, wherein the Biſhops are ſubſtituted, as perpetual and ſtanding *Delegates* of the Apoſtolick See for the *Execution* of them, and the former Reſervations remitted; though this to the great diminution of the Revenue of the Pope, and his Officers, as hath been ſaid.

§. 205. † Such Decrees are, *Seſſ.* 5. *c.* 1, 2. *De Reform.*—*Seſſ.* 6. *c.* 4.—*Seſſ.* 7. *c.* 6.—*Seſſ.* 13. *c.* 5.—*Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 5, 8.—*Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 5. 8.—*Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 11. And very many others. In which matter, though the Biſhops are impowred, as *Delegates* of the *See Apoſtolick*, becauſe the point, whether Biſhops hold their Juriſdictions, as to the exterior, and forenſick, exerciſe thereof, in, and over, ſuch particular things, and perſons, *immediatly* from Chriſt, or from the Pope, was indeed much agitated in the Council, but on no ſide determined. Yet ſo it is, that a poſſeſſion they have now of ſeveral branches of ſuch Juriſdiction, ſince this Council, which they had not before. Nor varies it any thing in the good ſervice actually done, thereby, to the Church, by what way ſoever this power deſcends upon them.

§. 212. To a. To come cloſer them to the Particulars. For. a. *Cauſes*; and *Appeales*: See the reſtraint made therein, *Seſſ.* 13. *c.* 1. *Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 1.—*Nec appellatio executionem hanc, quæ ad morum correctionem pertinet, ſuſpendat.* And, Seſſ. 24. c. 10.—*Nec in his, ubi de viſitatione, aut morum correctione agitur, exemptio, aut ulla inhibitio, appellatio, ſeu querela, etiam ad ſedem Apoſtolicam interpoſita, executionem eorum, quæ ab his mandata, decreta, aut judicata fuerint, quoquo modo impediat, aut ſuſpendat.* Again, Seſſ. 21. c. 8 —Seſſ. 25. c. 10. The Pope, and Council, delegate ſuch perſons, as ſhall be choſen in the Provincial, or Dioceſan, Synod, together with the Ordinary (to be ſupplied, if any one of them dies before the next Synod, by the Biſhop, and Chapter) to decide theſe Appeales in the *Province*, or Dioceſs, where ſuch Controverſies ariſe; unleſs they be ſuch, as for the weight of them are thought fit to be removed to *Rome*. Seſſ. 24. 5. It is ordered, That the criminal cauſes of Biſhops, except thoſe more heinous ones of Hereſie, or the like, where their ejectment is queſtioned, which are reſerved to the Apoſtolick See, are to be terminated either by a Provincial Council; or, in the interval, by its Deputies. And, *Ib. c.* 20. Civil, Matrimonial, Criminal Cauſes are left to be ended by inferior Tribunals (without the intermedling of the Popes legats, or Nuncio's, herein): except thoſe; *Quas, ex urgenti, rationabiliq; cauſa, judicaverit Summus Romanus Pontifex, per ſpeciale Reſcriptum ſignaturæ ſanctitatis ſuæ, manu propriâ ſubſcribendum,*

bendum, committere, aut avocare. Where, *ex urgenti, rationabiliq; causâ, rescriptum signaturæ sanctitatis suæ manu propriâ subscribendum*, a Rescript, after the matter is particularly made known to the Pope, and, upon this, his hand, and seal obtained, cannot be a thing so ordinarily happening, as to overthrow the whole benefit of the Decree, as *Soave* would perswade † † p. 792.

Next: Concerning the forementioned *Provincial*, and *Diocesan* Synods, which were to elect the persons for deciding such Appeales [which Synods the Council judged very necessary, —*Moderandis moribus, corrigendis excessibus, controversiis componendis*, &c. and to which it committed a chief superintendence over the actions of Bishops, as to their due execution of its Decrees touching Reformation.] It is ordered, Sess. 24. c. 2. That the Provincial Synods be called by the Metropolitan; or, he justly hindered, by the Senior Bishop of the *Province*, at least once every three years, after the Octave of Easter, or other time, if more convenient; and a Diocesan, once every year; In the calling of, and meeting in, which, if any neglected their Duty, they incur the Ecclesiastical Censures, prescribed by former Canons. And those Bishops, who are Subject to no Archbishop, are obliged to chuse some *Province*, of whose Synods they shall for the future be members, and be subjected to its decrees. Ordered also, that in these Synods (not having a constant being) certain Deputies be chosen, which may, in the Intervals, determine such Causes, and execute such Orders, as this Council hath committed to them. But mean while, as for other causes, not thought meet to be intrusted to Delegats, nor that conveniently can be so long suspended, as till another Provincial Synod sits (which for the great trouble, and charge of their meeting, later Councils, upon the experience of former Canons neglected, appointed to be held seldomer, nor yet is this obeyed) it seemed necessary, that without expecting these, such causes should, from the Pope, a higher standing Judge, receive a present dispatch (of which see what is said before, §. 16. *n.* 6. and *n.* 8.) And,—*The* restoring *of* Synodal Judicatures [*i. e.* as to all causes] (saith *Soave* †) *was rejected by almost all the Fathers of the Council*; For which he gives a reason, after his usual manner, the most uncharitable one, he could invent,—*That they did this, because such* Synodal *Judicatures did diminish the* Episcopal, *and were too popular. The Episcopal* he means taken singly in their distinct Courts; else the Synodal is nothing else but a conjunct Judicature of Bishops. But perhaps some of those reasons given by *Castellus*, for this (*apud Soave*, p. 335.) may seem more perswasive, *viz.* *Beside their being no standing Court, and rarely convened,* † p. 336.

vened, the difficulty that was found, to inform ſo many; and the impediments in the examination, where many are to do it; the infinite length in the proceedings and diſpatches; the parties and diviſions therein, that are uſually made by the factions; for which *Caſtellus* imagines, that Synods came to be, in later times, more intermitted; and other Courts, and Officers brought in, to remedy ſuch diſorders.

§. 214. Mean while; Of Appeales of higher conſequence received, and judged, by moſt holy Popes, Antiquity affords many examples. See more mentioned before, §. 13. *n.* 1. And, indeed, ſuch a ſuperlative power, as to *cauſes of greater moment*, ſeems very neceſſary. For, 1ſt. This *Prime Patriarch*, and ſupreme Governour in the Church, being conſtituted by a more *choiſe* Election, is preſumed ordinarily to be a more *knowing* perſon, and, according to the eminency of his place, aſſiſted both with a *wiſer* Council, and a greater portion of *God's Spirit*. But, 2ly, though he were neither more prudent, nor better informed from others in difficult matters, nor more aſſiſted from heaven, yet muſt he needs, be a *leſs partial* judge in ſuch matters, becauſe not ſo intereſſed in the *cauſe*, or in the *perſons*, as the *Metropolitan* often muſt be, or alſo thoſe other Biſhops, who live upon the place, and are ſubject to the Metropolitans power: Now, the more remote from all private intereſt, and high in place, the Judge is, the more even he is likely to hold the ſcales of Juſtice; and to adminiſter it, leſs ſweyed with affection, or maſtered by fear. 3ly. The chief Courts, to whom, beſide the Roman Biſhop, the termination of Appeales of moment is recommended, being Provincial, National, or General, Councils, were their Judgments never ſo ſatisfactory to all parties (though Provincial, or National Synods have not been alwaies thought ſo, witneſs thoſe Affrican ones in the cauſe of *Cecilianus*) yet are theſe not alwaies to be had: The Provincial Synods much ſeldomer aſſembled, than the Canons appoint; Councils General yet more rare; none of them, by reaſon of the trouble of convening, fit, upon every ſuch Appeale, to be called. 4ly. Many caſes of Appeales are not matters of Fact, where witneſſes are neceſſary; but queſtions, *de jure*, where the fact is confeſſed; and, in ſuch, no more plea can be made to have them tryed at home, than the Moſaical Legaliſts of *Antioch* could juſtly have demanded, not to have this matter decided at *Jeruſalem*; or *Arius* of *Alexandria*, his, at *Nice*. As for the conveniency of hearing witneſſes, where this neceſſary in ſuch Appeales, it was ordered indeed anciently; that, whenſoever it could ſafely be done, ſuch cauſes ſhould be arbitrated in the ſame, or ſome adjoyning, *Provinces*, by ſome Judges,

Judges, either ſent thither, or, there, delegated by the Patriarch (of which the Seventh Canon of *Sardica* ſeems to take ſpecial care;) or at leaſt, that Commiſſioners might be ſent to examin witneſſes at home; in the non-obſervance of which Canons perhaps ſome Roman Biſhops may have been culpable, and cauſed ſome affliction to the Churches Subjects: But yet other exigences may occur (every cauſe not being fit to be decided by Delegates) that require the trial to be before the Pope's own perſon, to which greater neceſſities the trouble cauſed to witneſſes muſt give place, which trials at *Rome* are alſo allowed by the Council of *Sardica*, *c.* 4. And we have no reaſon to think, but that this grave Aſſembly at *Sardica* weighed the troubles of ſuch Appeales, as well as the Affricans did afterward; or we now: but thought fit to admit ſmaller inconveniences to avoid greater miſchiefs, namely, in the Intervals of Councils, Schiſms, and Diviſions between Provincial, and between National, Churches, by the Church her having thus ſo many ſupremes terminating all ſpiritual cauſes within themſelves, as there were Provinces, or Countries, Chriſtian. 5ly. If this Avocation to the ſupreme be now done without the Method, ſometimes uſed, of aſcending by degrees through many ſubordinat Courts, this, when ſuch Courts have not a cogent power for terminating the Cauſe, ſeems only a ſhortning both of the trouble, and charge.

§. 215. To β.

To β. *Diſpenſations.* See, *Seſſ.* 25. *c.* 18. where, in General, Proviſion is made by the Council, That,—*Si urgens juſtaq; ratio, & major quandoq; utilitas, poſtulaverint cum aliquibus diſpenſandum eſſe; id, cauſâ cognita, ac ſummâ maturitate, atq; gratis, à quibuſcunq; ad quos diſpenſatio pertinebit, erit præſtandum; aliterq; facta diſpenſatio ſurreptitia cenſeatur.* This Diſpenſation, then, by whomſoever given, is to be made *gratis*; otherwiſe, to be held ſurreptitious; and the cognition of this ſurreption is referred to the Ordinary, *Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 5. Again ordered, *Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 5. *That no* Diſpenſations of Grace, *obtained at* Rome, *ſhall take effect, except firſt examined by the Biſhop of the place, whether obtained juſtly, and upon a right information.* Again, *Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 6. *Biſhops are impowred to diſpenſe with their Subjects,* in foro conſcientiæ, *in all irregularities, and ſuſpenſions, for ſecret offences, except voluntary murther,* &c. *and to abſolve in all caſes occult, that are reſerved to the See Apoſtolick.* Of which, and other the like, relaxations in this Councel, of their former reſtraints, what the iſſue hath been in the Court of *Rome*, ſee what is quoted before † out of *Pallavic. Introduction. c.* 10.

Mean

§. 216. Mean while, as the ſame Council hath obſerved, *Seſſ.* 25. *c.* 18. it ſeems neceſſary; That laws be not ſo enacted, as to leave in the hands of no perſon a power of *Diſpenſations*. And again neceſſary; That this power of Diſpenſing be not, as to matters more important, left alwaies in the hands of Inferior Magiſtrates; eſpecially thoſe living upon the place; and therefore more liable to be ſweyed by friendſhips, importunity, fear, and over-awing; this laſt, requiſite, that the obligation of laws, by the facility of diſpenſing, be not quite diſſolved; the firſt; that the law, too rigidly exacted, may not ſometimes oppreſs; And what *Civil* Government is there, that by its retaining a *Diſpenſative power*, as to their temporal laws, in the hand of the ſupreme Magiſtrate, doth not amply juſtifie the Eccleſiaſtick, herein?

§. 217. Such a *Diſpenſative power*, therefore, from antient times, hath been thought fit to be depoſited in the chief Biſhop of the Chriſtian Univerſe, and from him ſuch Diſpenſations, and relaxations to be received, as neceſſity requires. Such was that, conceded by S. *Gregory*, *l.* 12. *Ep.* 31. to the *Engliſh*, upon the hazzard of their deſerting the new-founded Chriſtianity, concerning Marriages, for a time in ſome degrees prohibited by the Canons of the Church, and that, to the *Sicilian* Biſhops (who could not be brought to do more) concerning holding a Provincial Council once a year, when the Canons required twice: Before him, ſuch that conceded by *Gelaſius*, in *Ep.* to the Biſhops in *Italy* (complaining to him that many of their Churches, by the Gothick wars, were rendred deſtitute of a Clergy) in which he relaxed ſeveral things required by the former Canons to Ordinations, *&c.* after he had made this Preface,—*Neceſſariâ rerum diſpenſatione conſtringimur, ſic Canonum paternorum decreta librare, & retro Præſulum, deceſſorumq; noſtrorum præcepta metiri: ut quæ præſentium neceſſitas temporum, reſtaurandis Eccleſiis, relaxanda depoſcit, quantum poteſt fieri, temperemus,—Igitur, tam inſtituendi quam promovendi clericalis obſequii ſic ſpatia diſpenſanda concedimus*, &c. Before him, by *Simplician*, Epiſtle 14. to the Emperor *Zeno*, in which he allowed the election of the Biſhop of *Antioch* made, for preventing a ſedition, at *Conſtantinople*, contrary to the Fourth *Nicen* Canon. And, before him, by *Celeſtine*, † allowing, by his Letters ſent to the Biſhops of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, the Election of *Proclus*, who was before the deſigned Biſhop of *Cyzicum*, to be Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, procured by the Emperor *Theodoſius* for preventing ſome Tumults; where the Pope either diſpenſed with, or more indulgently expounded, ſome former Church Canons that ſeemed, to have prohibited all Tranſlation of Biſhops. To

† *Socrat. Hiſt. l.* 7. *c.* 39, 40

† See *Conc. Antioch*, *c.* 2.

To γ. See the answer to κ.

§. 218 To δ. To δ. To δ. *Penſions*, reſerved by the Pope out of ſome richer Eccleſiaſtical Benefices, as rewards of perſons much meriting in the Churches ſervice; It ſeemed hard, ſuppoſe it could have been juſtly done, to deprive the Pope of them, whilſt Secular Princes would ſtill retain them; and were much diſpleaſed, when, in the Articles provided for Reformation of Princes, † ſuch things were demanded of themſelves, as they would have redreſſed in others; yet the Council thus far moderated this matter; That thoſe Biſhopricks, or Benefices, of a ſmaller Revenue, not amounting to above ſuch a certain ſumme yearly, ſhould not be, for the future, charged with any ſuch Penſions, *Seſſ.* 24. *c.* 13. And for the reſt, ſince all Penſions could not be voided, (which perhaps had been beſt;) yet may it ſeem as equitable, That the Eccleſiaſtick Governours do continue to make uſe of them for recompenſing perſons of extraordinary merit in the Church, as Princes, thoſe in the State; Eſpecially when the Council hath provided; that they be taken from no Church, but where ſuch an overplus may be ſpared; and that Revenue only applied to maintain two, which indeed is ſuperfluous for one.

† *Mentioned in* Soave, *p.* 769.

§. 219. To ε. To ε. The like, much-what, may be ſaid, of *Monaſteries*; or other Eccleſiaſtical *Benefices* with, or without, cure, given in *Commendam*, a ſuperintendence over which the Council hath committed for ever, either to the Superiors of ſuch Orders; or to the Biſhops, as the Popes Delegates; to take care, that in the one all religious obſervance be maintained, with all neceſſaries ſupplied; and in the other, the care of ſouls faithfully diſcharged, and the Vicar ſufficiently provided for: See *Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 8.—And, *Seſſ.* 25. 20. *Reform. Regul.* And further, *c.* 21. That for Monaſteries Commendatary, they, for the future, ſhall be conferred only on Regulars. A Conſtitution, which in *France*, where very many Monaſteries are given by the Prince in Commendams to great Perſonages, hath been one of the chief obſtacles of that Princes refuſing to accept this Council, as to its Acts of Reformation.

§. 220 To ζ. To ζ. The *uniting* of *Eccleſiaſtical Benefices*: As the Council doth allow ſuch an *union* to be made by the Biſhops, as Delegates of the Apoſtolick See, where one ſingle is not a ſufficient maintenance of the Paſtor, Seſſ. 21. c. 5.—Seſſ. 24. c. 15. And allows the ſame to be done in Biſhopricks by the Pope, upon Teſtimonials received from a Provincial Synod of ſuch a neceſſity, Seſſ. 24. 13. So, on the other ſide, Seſſ. 7. c. 6. It impowers Biſhops for ever, as the Popes Delegates, to inquire into all former

unitings of Livings passed within forty years, and to void them, *Nisi eas ex legitimis, aut alias rationabilibus causis, coram loci Ordinario vocatis, quorum interest, verificandis, factas fuisse constiterit.* And, *c.* 5. and 7. Constitutes the Bishops likewise visitors of all those having cure, that are annexed to Chapters, or Monasteries, that the incumbent Vicars do their duty, and be provided of a sufficient Revenue, all manner of priviledges, or exemptions, being repealed. See more below (λ).

§. 221. To n. *Exemptions.* This Council hath ordered, 1st. That all Churches whatever, though formerly exempted, those also that are annexed to Colledges, or Monasteries, be subjected to the yearly visitation of the Ordinary, as Delegate of the See Apostolick; to see to, that the *Cura animarum* be rightly discharged, all things kept in a due repair, *&c.* Sess. 7, 8. 2ly. Sess. 22. *c.* 8. Bishops, as Delegates of the Apostolick See, are made Executors of all pious Disposures, as well Testamentary, as of the living; *Hospitals* also, and whatever *Colledges*, Confraternities of *Laicks*, *Schooles*, the *Almes* of the *Mounts of Piety*, &c. whatever *Exemptions* they might have had formerly, are subjected to their visitation (where it is not otherwise ordered by the Founders,) to take knowledge of, and see executed therein, whatever is instituted for God's worship, salvation of souls, or sustentation of the poor, and the *Administrators* thereof tyed to give to them a yearly account (*c.* 9.) 3. Again; All Secular Clergy, that had formerly any *exemption*, and all *Cathedral Chapters* (formerly exempted under the notion of Regulars, which many of them anciently were) are likewise submitted, for the future, to the visitation, and correction of the Bishop — *Sess.* 6. 4. — *Sess.* 14. *c.* 4. — *Sess.* 25. 6. 4. As for *Regulars*; All such, living out of their Monasteries, and other persons whatever relating to them, or otherwise priviledged, may be visited, corrected, punished by the Bishop, as are others, *Sess.* 6. 3. — *Sess.* 29. 11. Nor may any Regulars preach in any Church, not belonging to their Order, without the Bishops licence first obtained; Nor in Churches of the Order, without first shewing to the Bishop a licence from their Superiors, and receiving his Benediction. 5. Lastly, for the Monasteries, and Religious Houses themselves exempted from the Episcopal Visitation, it is ordered; that, if the Regular Superiors, to whom this is committed, omit their duty, the Bishop, after a Paternal admonition, and their six moneths further neglect, may proceed to visit, and reform them; Notwithstanding whatever, Exemptions, or Conservators appointed of their Priviledges, *Sess.* 21. 8.

But an universal subjection of Monasteries, Universities, Colledges, to the Ordinary of the place, though motioned in the Council, was not approved by it. Not that such whose publick profession was a stricter life than that of all others, should injoy more liberty from Government; or, at least, from that of subordinate, and immediate superintendents; But because it seemed much more proper, that as their Profession was more severe, so they should be committed rather to the care of such Superiors, who themselves had the same obligations; which it was feared, that the Ordinary, living himself after a Secular way, would be more prone to mitigate, and relax; or some way, by contradicting their Orders, disturb their Peace. And therefore such exemption tended not to an enlargement of their liberty, but a confirming their restraints, and a quiet and undisturbed observance thereof. And such Exemptions and Priviledges we find anciently granted to Religious Houses by Popes famous in Sanctity. Of which see many in St. *Gregories* Epistles, not only conceded by himself, but mentioned to have been so by his Predecessors. See, *l.* 7. *Ep.* 33. and *Ep.* 18. And see—*l.* 11. *Ep.* 8. such Priviledges granted, at the request of the Queen of *France*. Yet still, as was said but now, the Episcopal power is admitted by the Council of *Trent* in these Houses also, upon any continued neglect of their other Superiors, when first admonished hereof. §. 222.

To θ. *Abuses* concerning *Indulgences*, and *Collecting* the *Charities* of Christians for pious uses: It was ordered, *Sess.* 21. c. 9. That the Office of the ordinary former publishers of such Indulgences, and Spiritual Favours, and the Collectors of such Charities (having given so much scandal, after the indeavour of three several precedent Councils to reform them) and all their priviledges, should be taken quite away; and hence forward, that the *Ordinary* of the place, assisted with two of the *Chapter*, should publish the one, and collect the other, *Gratis*. §. 223. To θ.

Thus much of this Councils rectifying those things, which seemed to minister any just cause of complaint concerning the Pope, or his Court; where also you see, how much the Episcopal Authority is inlarged by the Pope's free Concession to them of so many former *Reservations*, and *Exemptions*. So that *Lainez* the General of the Jesuites in his speech before the 24. Session † observes.—*That the hand of the Council had fallen heavy upon others, without touching at all the Bishops; that there was contained in those Articles of Reformation much against the Pope, against the Cardinals, against Arch-Deacons, against the Chapters, against Parish Priests, against the Regulars; but against the Bishops nothing.* And *Soave* † on §. 224. † See *Palla.* l. 23. c. 3. n. 30. p. 343 &c.

Sess. 13. produceth the Priests of *Germany* complaining of the Reformation; and saying,—*That the Bishops authority was made too great, and the Clergy brought into servitude.* And † on the 22th Session, saith,—*That points of Reformation were proposed favourable to the Authority of Bishops, that the Legats proceeding might not be hindered by the opposition of any.* From all which you may further gather, what truth his words have, set in the entrance of his History: †—*That the Bishops, hoping to regain the Episcopal Authority, usurped, for the most part, by the Pope, now wholy lost it; and the Pope, fearing a Moderation of his former exorbitant power, had it now, much more than ever, established, and confirmed.*

† p. 568.

† p. 2.

§. 225. To 2.

Next to proceed to the Grievances concerning the Clergy. To 2. The Complaint concerning *unfit*, and *unworthy* persons elected both into *Bishoprics*, and inferior *Benefices* of Cure.

1st. For the future Election of Bishops, this Council ordered, *Sess.* 24. *c.* 1. That there should be drawn up by the Provincial Synods a certain Form, for taking Informations, and examining the Persons nominated to such Ecclesiastical Dignities, to be approved by the Pope; Then, concerning the particular Person to be elected; an Instrument of the Examination, made according to the Form prescribed, is to be sent to his Holiness: And this Instrument there first to be perused by four Cardinals; who, if they also approve, are to subscribe it, and to affirm—*Se certo* (to give you the words of the Canon) *existimare, sub periculo mortis aternæ, idoneos esse, qui Ecclesiis præficiantur*; the relation also of these Cardinals is to be made in one Consistory; but the deliberation deferred to another, that things may be more exactly weighed. The person also to be chosen is particularly to have the Testimonial of his Ordinary, or of the Pope's *Nuncio*, residing in such place, *Sess.* 22. *c.* 2. And what course is observed in Bishops, the same ordered to be in the Election of Cardinals, *Sess.* 24. *c.* 1. Lastly, the Council admonisheth in General * all those, who have the Right of any such Collation,—*Eos mortaliter peccare, nisi eos præfici curaverint, quos* [not *dignos*, but] *digniores & Ecclesiis magis utiles, ipsi judicaverint*; And particularly, * the Pope, that, if he be faulty herein, either as to the Promotion of Cardinals, or Bishops, unfit,—*Ovium Christi sanguinem, quæ ex malo negligentium, & sui Officii immemorum Pastorum regimine peribunt, Dominus Noster Jesus Christus de manibus ejus sit requisiturus.*

§. 226. This for the Election of Bishops. Next, For the Election of worthy Persons into inferior *Church-Benefices* with Cure. 1st. It is ordered, *Sess.* 24. *c.* 18. That, whoever the Patron

Patron be, there be six Examiners nominated by the Diocesan Synod; all which, or at least three of them, together with the Bishop are, at a time prefix'd, publickly to try the sufficiency of such as are presented; and only such a person as is approved by them, or, if many be presented, who is thought the more worthy, is to be admitted to such Benefice; without such Examination, and approvement the Collation of such Benefice to be accounted Surreptitious; and another Election to be made. The Bishop being permitted thus to choose the Person, even where the Pope gives Institution.—*Ita Sanctissimus voluit* (saith the Congregation of Cardinals appointed for the Interpreters of the Decrees of the Council, †) *quia Episcopus melius cognoscit personas.* *Pius* the Fourth † having also, before this Session, concerning Benefices in his Disposal, made this free offer to the Fathers of the Council. 1. Either, that henceforth all Benefices having *Curam Animarum*, should be in their Gift, and the other *without Cure* in his. Or, that henceforth he would bestow them on none, who shall not also be, by the *Ordinary* approved *worthy*. 3. Or, that he would only make his Election out of such Persons, *worthy*, and of the *Diocess*, of whom the Bishop should send him a Roul: After which, the Council agreed upon the Constitution forementioned: Which not escaping *Soave's* Censure, who saith,—*That it was framed with exquisite artifice, and with a fair shew makes the Bishops Patrons to give the Cure to whom they please, upon pretence of Examinations But yet taketh no profit from the Court of* Rome: [The Institution still being reserved to the Pope, and a Bull to be had from thence.] *Pallavicino* † returns this answer,—*That any reasonable man may well observe what a loss here of his own benefit the Pope consented to, for the benefit of the Church, when he was pleased to take from himself the bestowing according to his own choise* [by this being now left to the Bishop, and the Examiners] *of so many Benefices, as should happen to be vacant, for eight months in the year, in so many Kingdoms* of Christendom; *and when he deprived his Court of that frequent Concourse, formerly made to it, of so many forreign Ecclesiasticks, who, otherwise, must first have made themselves known there, for the obtaining these Benefices at home.*

† In 24. *Sess.* *c.* 18. *fig.* 33.

† Pallavic. *l.* 22. *c.* 1. *n.* 18. quoting Card. *Borrom.* letter to the Legats.

† *l.* 23. *c.* 3. 12.

§. 227.

2. Again; to remove all temptations, arising from *gain*, to introduce persons into the Clergy of less worth: It is ordered, Sess. 21. c. 1. that all things be passed *Gratis*; save that the under-officers, such as have no set stipend, may receive some small fee, not to exceed the tenth part of a *Crown* for their labours, provided the Collator share nothing in it.—*Nihil* (saith the Council) *pro collatione quorumcunque Ordinum, etiam clericalis Tonsura, nec*

pro

pro litteris dimissoriis, aut testimonialibus, nec pro sigillo, nec alia quacunq; de causâ, etiam sponte oblatum, Episcopi & alii ordinum Collatores, aut eorum Ministri, quovis prætextu, accipiant. Notarii vero in iis tantum locis, in quibus non viget laudabilis consuetudo nihil accipiendi, pro singulis literis dimissoriis, aut Testimonialibusq; decima in in tantum unius, aurei partem accipere possint; dummodo eis nullum Salarium sit constitutum pro officio exercendo; nec Episcopo ex Notarii commodis aliquod Emoluentum, ex eisdem, Ordinum Collationibus directe, vel indirecte, provenire possit; tunc enim gratis operam suam eos præstare omnino teneri decernit: And — *Qui secus fecerint, tam dantes quam accipientes, ultra divinam ultionem, pœnas a jure inflictas ipso facto incurrant:* which Decree is understood also of the *Collation* of *Benefices*, and of *Dispensations*. See the Exposition of the Congregation of Cardinals on this Decree, §. *Item Declarat.*

§. 228. 3ly. To see also the Parochial duties rightly discharged by the Clergy: It is ordered, *Sess.* 24. 3. That the Bishop by himself, or his Vicar, visit yearly his Dioceſs; or, if large, the greatter part of it; and the Remainder in the year following; and that the Provincial Councils punish any Bishops neglects herein.

§. 228. 4ly. Ordered also, *Sess* 24. *c.* 4. That the Bishop, as Apostolical Delegate, where the People of a Parish are very numerous, may either erect a new, dividing the Profits; or compel the Rector of such Parish, when not able alone to perform the Pastoral Duty to so great a multitude, to admit, and maintain so many other Priests, assistant, as may be sufficient; and also, where the Bishop finds an illiterate Rector, who is otherwise of a good life, may add a Coadjutor, partaker of the Profits. See Sess. 21. c. 6.

§. 230. 5ly Ordered also, Sess. 23. c. 18.—That, for the better supply of the Ecclesiastical Ministry, in all Cathedral Churches be erected a Seminary, for the educating a certain number of children of poor people (or also of rich, if maintained by themselves) arrived to twelve years of age, in studies, and a discipline, fitting them for the Ministry. Which children, at their first entrance shall receive tonsure, and alwaies wear a Clergy habit; for the, maintainance of whom, the Bishop, with four of the Clergy joyned with him, are to detract a certain portion from the Bishops Revenue, and all the Benefices of the Dioceſs, and the care, of seeing this Order executed by the Bishop, committed to the Provincial Council.

§. Again,

6. Again; It is ordered, Seſſ. 5. c. 1.—*Ne Cœleſtis ille ſacrorum librorum Theſaurus, quem ſpiritus ſanctus ſummâ liberalitate hominibus tradidit, neglectus jaceat* (ſaith the Council) that Divinity-Lectures, for the expounding of the Holy Scriptures, where theſe yet wanting, ſhould be ſet up in all Cathedral, and Collegiate Churches; in the Convents of Regulars; and publick Schooles of learning; and, in poorer Churches, at leaſt a School-Maſter founded, to teach Grammar: All ſuch Lectures to be approved by the Biſhop: And for their Maintainance, the firſt vacant Prebend, or a ſimple Benefice, or a Contribution from all the Benefices of ſuch City, or Dioceſs, to be applied to this uſe. All theſe Conſtitutions made for a better Proviſion for the future, of a learned and vertuous Clergy. §. 231.

7. Laſtly; For introducing amongſt this Clergy a greater *ſtrictueſs* and *Holineſs* of *Life*: This Council revives and gives vigour to all the former rigid ancient Canons; notwithſtanding whatever preſent, contrary, cuſtoms, with the ſame or greater penalties to be inflicted on offenders, at the arbitrement of the *Ordinary*; and that, without admitting any appeales from his Cenſures. See Seſſ. 22. c. 1. *de Reform.*—*Statuit* S. *Synodus, ut quæ alias à ſummis Pontificibus, & à ſacris Conciliis de Clericorum vitâ, honeſtate, cultu, doctrinâq; retinendâ, ac ſimul, de luxu, comeſſationibus, choreis, aleis, luſibus, ac quibuſcunq; criminibus, nec non ſæcularibus negociis, fugiendis, copioſe ac ſalubriter ſancita fuerunt, eadem in poſterum, iiſdem pœnis, vel majoribus, arbitrio Ordinarii imponendis, obſerventur: nec Appellatio executionem hanc, quæ ad morum correctionem pertinet, ſuſpendat; Si qua vero ex his* [Sancitis] *in deſuetudinem abiiſſe compererint,* [Ordinarii] *ea quamprimum in uſum revocari, & ab omnibus accurate cuſtodiri, ſtudeant, non obſtantibus conſuetudinibus quibus cunq; ne ſubditorum neglecta emendationis ipſi condignas, Deo vindice, pœnas perſolvant.* This heavy charge have the Biſhops in this Council laid upon Biſhops concerning reformation of the inferior Clergy.

To λ. *Pluralities*, and poſſeſſing ſuperfluous wealth: It is ordered, Seſſ. 24. c. 17. That no perſon for the future (Cardinals themſelves not excepted) ſhall hold two Biſhopricks, or other Eccleſiaſtical Benefices, either *ſimple*, if one of them ſufficient to maintain him, or *with Cure*, and requiring *reſidence*, on any terms whatever; and that all, having ſuch *Pluralities*, ſhall, within ſix moneths, quit one, all former Diſpenſations, or unions for life, notwithſtanding; and, if this not done within ſuch time, they to loſe both; pronounced, then, to be vacant, and diſpoſed of, otherwiſe: *A rule, in Benefices requiring Reſidence, ſtill Religiouſly obſerved,* §. 232 To λ

† 23. c. 11. n. 8. ‡ p. 792. *observed*, ſaith *Pallavic.*† (one who well knew the Popes Court) replying to *Soave*, ‡ who ſaith, *this Canon was too good to be kept, ſave in the poorer ſort.* And for other ſimple Benefices without Cure, as it is granted, that many are ſtill poſſeſſed by one, and the ſame Perſon; ſo is this a thing permitted by this Rule, where one ſuch living is inſufficient for his maintainance.

§. 233. Mean while: For the Moderation alſo of this Clergy-maintenance; the Council, Seſſ. 25. c. 1. layes a charge, aſcending from Pariſh Priests to Biſhops, and Cardinals, that, according to the ancient Canons,† none ſpend more of the Church-Revenue upon themſelves, than their Condition neceſſarily requires; nor beſtow the remainder thereof on any of their Secular Relations, further than the relieving them, when, and as, *poor*; but expend it on thoſe pious uſes (*viz.* for maintainance of *Holy Perſons*, and *things*; and the *poor*) to which it is dedicated. Its words there are,— *Sancta Synodus, exemplo Patrum noſtrorum in Concilio Carthaginenſi, non ſolum jubet, ut Epiſcopi modeſtâ ſupellectile, & menſâ, ac frugali victu, contenti ſint; verum etiam in reliquo vitæ genere, ac tota ejus domo, caveant, ne quid appareat, quod à ſancto hoc Inſtituto ſit alienum, quodq; non ſimplicitatem, Dei zelum, ac vanitatum contemptum, præ ſe ferat. Omnino vero eis interdicit, ne ex reditibus Eccleſiæ conſanguineos, familiareſve ſuos, augere ſtudeant; cum & Apoſtolorum Canones prohibeant, ne res Eccleſiaſticas, quæ Dei ſunt, conſanguineis donent; ſed, ſi pauperes ſint, iis, ut pauperibus, diſtribuant: Eas autem non diſtrahant, nec diſſipent, illorum cauſa: Imo, quam maxime poteſt, eos ſancta Synodus monet, ut omnem humanum hunc erga fratres, nepotes, propinquoſq; carnis affectum, unde multorum malorum in eccleſia ſeminarium extitit, penitus deponant:— Quæ vero de Epiſcopis dicta ſunt, eadem non ſolum in quibuſcunq; Beneficia Eccleſiaſtica, tam ſæcularia, quam regularia obtinentibus, pro gradus ſui conditione, obſervari, ſed & ad ſanctæ Romanæ Eccleſiæ Cardinales pertinere, decernit,* &c. And ſee, Seſſ. 22. c. 11. Therefore alſo it was anciently decreed: || That, a Clergiman having an Eſtate of his own, It, and the profits thereof, ſhould be kept diſtinct from their Church means; That, in leaving their own to their Secular Heirs; the reſt, whether Lands, Rents, Tithes, or Oblations, ſhould be preſerved for the uſes of the Church: Where (occaſionally) may be conſidered the great difficulty married Prieſts would undergo to be faithful in ſuch a truſt; and, to ſpend no more of the Churches Revenue on ſo near Relations, as Wife, and Children, than what may relieve their neceſſities in ſuch a manner, as he doth thoſe of the *poor*.

† *Conc. Car.* 4. c. 15. *Can. Apoſtol.* 39, 40. 75.--*con. Antioch* c. 21 —*Gratian Cauſ.* 12, 9. 1, 2. *De Rebus Eccleſiis diſpenſandis.*

|| *Canon. Apoſt.* 40. —*Concil Agatheni*, c. 48. & *Gratian. cauſ.* 12. q. 1.

To

To the same end, the Council, Sess. 14. c. 6. prescribes to the Clergy not to wear any *Laical Habit*, —*Pedes in diversis ponentes, unum in divinis, alterum in carnalibus*; but a *Clerical*, suiting to their Order, upon pain of the sequestring, and if they continue obstinate, Privation of their Benefices. Again, Sess. 22. c. 1. Renews the observance of all those former Church-Canons.—*Quæ de luxu, commessationibus, ebrietate, aleis, lusibus, ac quibuscunq; criminibus, nec non sæcularibus negotiis, fugiendis, copiosè, ac salubriter sancita fuerunt, iisdem pœnis, vel majoribus, arbitrio Ordinarii imponendis*: And, that no appeale should frustrate the execution of these laws, which belong to the correction of manners. §. 234.

To μ. *Non-Residence.* In Sess. 23. c. 1.—And,—Sess 6. c. 1, 2. 1st. It is declared by the Council; That neither Bishops, nor inferior Clergy, enjoying any Benefice with *Cura animarum*, may be absent from their charge at any time, without a just cause; and, that, by their long, and causless absence, they incur *mortal sin*. 2ly, As to Bishops; for the absence of two months, or, at the most, three in the year, the Council leaves the Examen of this just cause of such absence to their conscience, *Quam speret, religiosam, & timoratam fore; cum Deo corda pateant, cujus opus non fraudulenter agere, suo periculo tenetur*; yet admonisheth them especially to forbear this absence, as to *Advent, Lent, the Feasts of the Nativity, and Resurrection, Pentecost, and Corpus Christi*. 3ly But then, ordered; That none, whether Bishop, or also Cardinal, exceed such time of two or three moneths in the year, except upon a cause allowed, under their hand, by the Pope, or the Metropolitan; or, for the Metropolitans absence, by the Senior Resident-Bishop of the Province; the Provincial Council being impowred to see to, that there be no abuses committed in such licences; and that the due penalties be executed on the faulty. 4ly As for *Priests* having *cure*; the Bishop may prohibit their absence for any time, exceeding two or three dayes, unless they have a licence under his hand for it, upon some cause approved: Nor yet is such licence for *just cause* to be granted them, for above two moneths, unless this be very pressing, —*Discedendi autem licentiam, ultra bimestre tempus, nisi ex gravi causâ, non obtineant*. 5ly. Among *just Causes* of absence, as the Congregation of Cardinals hath interpreted the Council, such as these are not allowed; * want of a House; * a Suit in Law about the living; * a perpetual sickness; or if it not such, as that, for the Cure thereof, either Medicines, or a Physitian, is wanting in the place of Residence; upon which, absence may be conceded for three or four moneths, if necessity require so much; * An unhealthful §. 235. To μ.

aire of the place, to one bred elsewhere; unless this aire such only for some certain time; * absence desired for study; for a sufficiency of learning is supposed to be found, by the Examiners, in such persons, when elected: * Their being Officials of the Pope, or imployed in some service of the Bishop, or Cathedral Church; unless it be their assistance of him in the Visitation; * The living at a distance three or four miles off, and visiting his Church, every Lords day. These, I say, and some others are held no just causes, for which Residence may be dispensed with. 6ly, Where such Residence is, for a time, justly dispensed with, the Bishop is to take care, that, in such absence, an able Vicar be substituted with a sufficient allowance out of the Profits, by the Bishops arbitration. 7ly, The Penalty of absence, that is not thus allowed, is Sequestration of Profits for time of absence: to be applied, by the Ecclesiastical Superior, to pious uses; Or, in such absence continued above a year, and further contumacy shewed, when admonished thereof, ejectment out of such Bishoprick, or Living; The former to be done by the Pope, whom the Metropolitan, or Senior Bishop-Resident, is obliged to inform thereof by Letter, or Messenger, within three moneths; the latter, by the Ordinary. 8ly, All former Exemptions, or priviledges, for non-residence, abrogated. See also the like strictness concerning the Residence of the *Canons* of *Cathedral* Churches, and *Personal* performance of their Church-Offices, Sess. 24. c. 12.

§. 236. n. 1. To 7. To 7. The *want* of frequent *Preaching*, and *Catechising*: As the Council orders, Sess. 23. c. 14. That the Bishops take care, that the Priests on every Sunday, and solemn Festival, celebrate Mass; so concerning *Preaching*, *Sess.* 5. *c.* 2. and *Sess.* 24. *c.* 4. They do declare it to be the chief office of a Bishop, and injoyn it to be performed by him in the Cathedral, and by other inferior Clergy, having care of Souls, in their Parishes, at least, on all *Lords dayes*, and *solemn Festivals*; Or, if the Bishop be some way letted, that he cannot do it himself; then, that he procure another to do it, at his charge; as also, if the Rector of a Parish be hindered, or do neglect such office, the Bishop is to substitute another to supply it, appointing to him part of the Profits. In which Sermons, the Council injoyns;—*Ut plebes sibi commissas, pro suâ, & earum capacitate, pascant, salutaribus verbis; docendo, quæ scire omnibus necessarium est ad salutem; annunciandoq; eis, cum brevitate, & facilitate sermonis, vitia, quæ eos declinare, & virtutes, quas sectari oporteat, ut pœnam æternum evadere, & cælestem gloriam consequi, valeant.* The Bishop also is to take care, that in time of

of Advent, and Lent, in ſuch places as he thinks it meet, Sermons be had *every* day, or *three* times a week: and in theſe things the Biſhop hath power to compel, if need be, with Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures.

The Biſhop is to take care alſo; That, at leaſt on every *Lords day*, and other *Feſtivals*, the Prieſt do *catechiſe* the Children of his Pariſh, and teach them the Principles of their faith, and obedience to God, and their Parents: Finally, Seſſ. 24. c. 7.—and Seſſ. 22. c. 8. to ſee to; That before the Sacraments be adminiſtred, the force, and uſe of them be explained to the people in the *vulgar tongue*; and that the Catechiſme, to be ſet forth by the Council, be alſo faithfully tranſlated into the *vulgar*, and expounded to the people by their Paſtors; and that alſo, in the celebration of the Maſs, and other Divine Service,—*Sacra eloquia, & ſalutis monita eâdem vernaculâ lingua, ſingulis diebus feſtis, vel ſolemnibus, explanentur*; That the Holy Scriptures, and inſtructions neceſſary for Salvation, be explained to them on all Holydaies, and ſolemn Feſtivals, in the vulgar tongue; without handling any unprofitable matter, or queſtion. §. 236. n. 2.

Thus, there remaining no more obligation on the Church, than to render ſo much of divine matters, or exerciſes intelligible to the common people, as is neceſſary for them to know, or practice; and this abundantly performed; the Council, notwithſtanding earneſt petitions to the contrary, ſaw much reaſon, to retain in the *Latin* Church the ſame conſtancy, as is found in the *Greek*; and to continue the Divine Service ſtill in the ſame language, and words, without any alteration, in which their Anceſtors had delivered it to them, and in which it had deſcended, to theſe, from all former ages (as for this Weſtern Church) ever ſince that, next to the Apoſtles times. Neither doth this, or the following Ages ſeem imprudently to have choſen, for this ſervice, the *moſt common* language, in the underſtanding whereof all theſe Nations are united, and concur: So that, however any removed their Station, they might ſtill find the Divine Service both in matter, and words, the ſame; and any Prieſt, however he changed his Reſidence, be able to ſerve the people in it. §. 237.

To ξ. The *Clergies* being *reſtrained* from *Marriage*, and living *continently*. 1ſt. The Council, retaining the antient doctrine of the Church, ſo expounding the Scriptures, † holds: That *Continency* is a Grace, or Gift, which, though not actually poſſeſſed by all, yet is denied, by God, to none, who, with uſing due means, and preparations thereto, ſeek it of him; the uſing of which means is a thing in every ones power (in ſuch ordinary §. 238. To ξ † *Matt.* 19. 11.—1 *Cor.* 7. 78. &c,

ſence, as other humane actions are ſaid to be.) 2ly. That *Continency* being thus, by every one, either poſſeſſed, or attainable, the *vow* of perpetual *Celibacy* is lawful; which is a thing ſeconded by the univerſal practice of the Religious, or Monaſticks, as well in the Eaſtern, as Weſtern, Church: all of them making ſuch a vow. 3ly, Holds; That ſuch Celibacy, attainable, and obſervable by all, may be injoyned, and impoſed, by the Church, on ſome; *viz.* ſuch, as ſhall deſire to enter into the Prieſtly Function, for many weighty reaſons; and particularly, for thoſe given by the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 7. 28, 32, 34 35, 38. — *Ut non habeant tribulationem carnis,* — *ut ſint ſine* [mundanâ] *ſolicitudine* — *ut ſint ſancti & corpore, & ſpiritu; ut faciant, non bene, ſed melius:* Whilſt, mean while, none at all are compel'd abſolutely either to become Prieſts; or, in order to it, to profeſs Celibacy: (but only; that if they are deſirous of the one, they muſt undergo the burden of the other:) nor none inſtructed, that God's law, but only the Churches Conſtitution, doth require it of them. 4ly. The Council had alſo, in this matter, the warrantable Precedent of former ages, both in the Occidental, and Oriental, Churches, ſo far; as that none at all, entring into the holy Order of Prieſthood in either Church, hath been hitherto permitted, *after*, to marry. 5ly. The Council, injoyning this, doth not deny this *Celibacy* of the Clergy, (as being only Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution) to be *diſpenſable*. And, though the Council it ſelf thought not fit to give ſuch diſpenſation, eſpecially ſince thoſe *Princes*, and their *Prelats* in the Council, whoſe Kingdoms remained untainted with *Proteſtaniſme*, oppoſed it (. See *Soave* p. 688, and 690. Where he ſaith, *That the King of* Spain, *and his Prelats, had neither Intereſt* [i. e. out of any neceſſary compliance with Sects] *nor affection, to proſecute the three Inſtances of the marriage of Prieſts, communion of the Cup, and uſe of the vulgar tongue*): Yet neither doth the Council *prohibit* any ſuch diſpenſation, if at any time, circumſtances conſidered, it ſhall ſo ſeem good to the Pope. And ſo he, after the Council ended, was, both by the Emperour, and the Duke of *Bavaria*, much ſollicited for it, † I mean, for a toleration of it in their Dominions; being in hopes of reclaiming thereby ſome of the Sectariſts. But, both the Emperours death, following ſhortly after, hindred the further proſecution of it; and the Pope ſeemed very averſe from gratifying any Prince with ſuch an indulgment, of which he knew not, where it would ſtop; nor how far it might draw on Petitions from other places, in the ſame, or alſo in other, matters; and thoſe, perhaps, of much more prejudice to the Churches welfare. In which thing, *Soave* alſo

† See *Soave*, p. 823, 824 *Pallav. l.* 24. *c.* 12. *n.* 9.

also † is pleased to recommend the Popes prudence therein. † p. 690.

§. 239. A Dispensation therefore in this matter, though lawful, neither the Council, nor Pope, to whom such power was left, thought expedient. But the Parochial Clergy, by reason of their Secular Imployment, and converse, being much more exposed, than Regulars, to the breach of this holy Resolution of perpetual continency in a single life, and by their fall herein, highly offending God, and also bringing great scandal on their sacred Profession, the Council, *Sess.* 25 c. 14. made the strictest laws, that could well be devised, against any such miscarriage; prohibiting Priests to keep any women, of whom might be reasonable suspicion, either in their house, or abroad; or to have any converse with such: Among which suspitious persons, saith the third Canon of Conc. *Nice*, are to be reckoned all: *Nisi Mater, aut Soror. aut Avia, aut Avita, vel matertera, sit. In his namq; solis personis, & harum similibus, omnis quæ ex mulieribus est suspitio, declinatur*: which Canon the 3d. *Carthag.* Council thus expoundeth, or inlargeth,—*Sorores & filiæ fratrum, aut sororum, & quæcunque ex familiâ, domesticâ necessitate, antequam ordinatis Parentibus, uxores acceperunt, aut servis, non habitantibus in domo, quas ducant, alunde ducere, necessitas fuit.*

ℵ ordinarent, eam cum eis habitabant. vel sibi talli earū. cum ordinatis Parentib⁹ §. 240.

Next the Council ordaineth: That the faulty herein, after the first admonition by the Bishop, should lose the third part of the profits of their Benefice; and after the second, not amending it, *all*; and further should be suspended from officiating; And, after disobeying a third admonition, should be *ejected out of* their Living, and made incapable of another. And the Bishop to proceed herein, without any formal Conviction in Court, so the verity of the fact were sufficiently proved to him. Their Concubines also, by the aide of the Secular Power, to be expelled the Town, or the Dioceses. [And *Sess.* 21. c. 6. the same power of Ejection of the Clergy, when found incorrigible, the Bishops have, as to any other great and scandalous faults, without the relief of any Exemptions or Appeales.] But if a Bishop were so faulty, after an admonition, from the Provincial Synod, if no amendment, he was to be suspended; and, still continuing so, the same Synod to inform the Pope thereof; and he to proceed to the Deposition of him from his Bishoprick: the Council providing also, that this their Constitution should not hinder the force and execution of any former Laws, or Canons, made for the correction of such crime.

§.241. To π. *With-holding the Communion of the Cup.* 1st. The Council, Sess. 21. c. 1. following the custom, and judgment, of former Churches, declares: That there is no divine Precept, that obligeth all Communicants to receive in both kinds; since the frequent practice of Antiquity, to some persons, in some places, administred it only in one kind, when yet there was a possibility (though not convenience) of doing it in both: and esteemed this a sufficient, and lawful, Communion, and no way offending against any command of our Lord, enjoyning the contrary. 2ly It is a thing not denied by Protestants, that Christ, now no more divisible, is totally contained in, or exhibited by, every particle of either Symbol. 3ly These things supposed, the Council maintains, *Ib. c.* 12. that the Church did not change the former ordinary custom of receiving in both kinds, without great, and just cause, moving her thereto. 4ly But yet the Council grants also; That some just Motives there may be for restoring the use of the Cup; especially as to some particular places, or persons; and, lastly, referreth the judgment of these, and Concession of it, to the Pope's prudence: the impediment, that no such *Dispensation* was conceded by the Council it self (upon so much importunity, used by several Princes, who having their States much imbroiled with new Sects, hoped, by this way, to give them some satisfaction) being this; That the Fathers in the Council did not unanimously concur in the same judgment, but the Spanish Bishops, chiefly, made great opposition to it: as they not having the same motives, which others for such an alteration; and much fearing, least some Division might happen between National Churches from the Communion celebrated, in a several manner. † Neither were the rest willing to pass such an act, with the displeasure of so considerable a party. Though (if we may believe *Soave*) the Legats of the Pope, then *Pius* Fourth, (who of himself also was well inclined to grant it †) laboured much for the Concession of it; || Of which Concession these conditions also were proposed by some in the Council, †—*That the Cup should never be carried out of the Church: and that the bread only should be sufficient for the sick; that it should not be kept, to take away the danger of its sowring; that they should use little pipes to avoid effusion, as was formerly done in the Roman Church.* And when it could not be passed in the Council, *Pro*, being strongly opposed (as was said) by the Spanish Bishops, and others, where the Reformed Religion had taken no root, it was with much diligence, by the same Legats, procured, that it should not be voted *contra*; but referred to the Pope; and this reference also first was drawn up with a clause, of the Councils approbation of

† See *Soave*, p. 459.

† See *Soave*, p. 459.

|| *Soave*, p. 567.

† *Soave*, p. 525.

of the Conceſſion thereof, if he ſo pleaſed, in this manner, ‖ *That, ſince the Council could not at preſent determine ſuch affair, They remitted it to the judgment of his Holineſs: who, premiſing the diligences that he thought fit, ſhould either with the Conditions forementioned, or ſome other, according to his prudence, allow the uſe thereof, if it ſhould ſeem good to him, with the vote and approbation of the Council.* But neither would ſuch clauſe paſs (See *Soave*, p. 569. But to the Pope, at laſt, it was referred, unbyaſſed any way by the Council, to do that in it, — *Quod utile Reipublicæ Chriſtianæ, & ſalutare petentibus uſum Calicis, ſore judicaverit.* †

‖ *Apud Pallav. l.* 18, *c.* 7. *n.* 13.

† *Conc. Trid. Seſſ.* 22. *fin.*

§. 242.

And ſo it was, that, after the Council ended, the Pope, upon the Petition of the Emperour, and ſome others, ‖ granted the uſe of the Cup to ſome parts of *Germany*. Though this practice, not having ſuch effect as was hoped, for reducing Sectariſts (as who differed from Catholicks in ſo many other points; for which, though they ſeem to have leſs pretence, yet they did retain, in them, no leſs obſtinacy) neither did it continue long amongſt the Catholicks; who deſired, in this matter, to conform to the reſt of the Church. The ſame practice was likewiſe indulged formerly by the Popes to the Greeks in *Polonia*, to the Maronites, and others, reconciled to the Church of *Rome*, that they ſhould ſtill receive the Sacrament in both kinds, after their former manner; *viz.* the Body of our Lord intinct in the Blood, and both delivered them out of the Chalice in a Spoon. Indulged alſo by Pope *Paul* the Third, † in the Ceſſation of the Council, to thoſe in *Germany*, who ſhould humbly demand it, nor did condemn the Churches contrary practice; and, ſo that it were done, neither in the ſame time, nor place, with that [Communion] which is given by decree of the Church; this caution, I ſuppoſe, being inſerted, to avoid the offence, which others, communicating only in one kind, might take thereto. Indulged alſo formerly to the *Bohemians*, and *Moravians* by the Council of *Baſil* (See *Hiſtor. Bohem. apud Æneam Silvium, c.* 52. — *His* [Boemis, & Moravis] *qui conſueviſſent, ſub binâ ſpecie, panis ſcilicet & vini, divina Euchariſtia communicare licebit.* And, ſhould any Pope or Council reſtore the uſe of the Cup generally to the whole Church, yet can this no way infer any variation of the Churches Faith, or Confeſſion of her former Error. For in ſuch matters of practice, where no divine precept confineth us to any ſide, the doing one thing is far from inferring a confeſſion of the unlawfulneſs of having done the contrary; unleſs the Pope, or Council, ſhould reſtore the Cup upon this reaſon, becauſe our Lord hath *expreſly commanded it.* But then, as this would ſhew a fault, ſo it would no leſs condemn the practice of antiquity, than the preſent.

‖ *Soave*, p. 823.

† *Soave*, p. 293, & 294. 24

To §.

§. 243. n. 1. To 6.

To 6. The too much *frequency* of *Excommunication*. See the Proviſion made by the Council againſt it, *Seſſ.* 25. *De Reform. Gener. c.* 3. Excommunication to be forborn, where any other puniſhment, effective, can be inflicted.

§. 243 n. 2. To 7.

To 7. *Diſorders* of *Monaſticks*. See the reformation of them delivered; Seſſ. 25. in 22. Chapters. Wherein, amongſt other things, it is ordered: * That frequent *Viſitations* be made of ſuch Houſes for the ſtrict obſervance of their Rule; and, for this purpoſe, thoſe Houſes, formerly ſubjected immediatly to the Pope, are ſubmitted to the Biſhop, as his Delegat. * That none living in any ſuch Houſes retain any *Propriety*: nor any *ſuperfluous expence* be made therein, not ſuiting to the vow of Poverty. * That Monaſticks never depart from their Convent, for the ſervice of any place, or perſon, or any pretence of other imployment whatſoever, without a *Licence* obtained in writing from their Superior; otherwiſe, to be puniſhed by the Biſhop, as *Deſertors* of their Profeſſion. * That none ſhall have leave to wear their habit ſecretly. None be permitted to depart, from an Order more ſtrict, to one of more liberty. * That the Biſhop take care, That any offending ſcandalouſly out of his Convent receive due puniſhment. * That all Superiours, and Officers be elected by ſecret ſcrutiny. * That no Eſtate, or Goods of any Novice (ſave for his food and apparel) be received by any Monaſtery before his Profeſſion, that ſo, after his Novice-ſhip ended, he may retain a perfect freedom to depart, if ſo inclin'd. For *religious Houſes* of *Women*: * That none either receive the *Habit*, or *profeſs* without firſt being examined by the Biſhop, concerning her willingneſs, and free inclination, thereto. * That in ſuch Houſes, moſt ſtrict *clauſure* be obſerved. None to *go forth* on what occaſion ſoever, without the *Biſhop* be firſt acquainted therewith, and *licence* it: None, of what ſex, or age ſoever, to *enter in*, without the licence of the *Biſhop*, or *Superioreſs*: All ſuch *Votaries* enjoyned to *Confeſs*, and *Communicat*, at leaſt *once a month*, — *Ut eo ſalutari præſidio ſe muniant* (ſaith the Council) † *ad omnes oppugnationes Dæmonis fortiter ſuperandas*. Theſe, and many other like, Conſtitutions were paſſed by this Synod of *Biſhops*, for the reforming of *Monaſticks*: the effect of which *Decrees*, ſince the time of this Council, hath been very great, both as to removing much former *ſcandal*, and reſtoring *Diſcipline* relaxed. And perhaps if ſome *Religious* Houſes, that now lie in aſhes, had but ſtood, till theſe Decrees of *Trent* might have been applied to their great diſtempers, theſe ſevere remedies might have healed thoſe *Corruptions*, for which, ſtill more and more putrifying, and increaſing, it is to be feared, the hand of *God's Juſtice* cut them off.

† *De Reform Reg. c.* 10.

To 7.

To 7. *Correction* of the *Breviary* and *Miſſal*, See, Seſſ. 25. *Decret. de Brev.* Where the Council, having committed this affair to certain Selected Fathers, and being neceſſitated to conclude, before it was finiſhed, leave the care of it to the Pope; after which, the ſame Fathers, with ſome others joyned to them, ſtill proſecuting it in *Pius* the Fourth's daies, Both the Miſſal, and Breviary thus corrected, and reduced to a greater uniformity, were licenced and publiſhed by his Succeſſor, *Pius* Fifth. §. 243. n. 3. To 7.

Thus I have run through many particulars, wherein the wiſdom, and diligence of this Council (joyned, in the *later*, and *Principal*, actions thereof, with a Pope much inclined the ſame way, and alſo much ſweyed by his holy Nephew *Carlo Borromeo*) indeavoured to repair the defects obſerved, and ſcandals complained of, in the former Eccleſiaſtical Government, and Diſcipline. By which it is clear, that many things are reduced into a much better order ſince this Council, than they were in before; and the oppoſition of many enemies ſearching into the faults of thoſe times, (by the Divine Providence bringing good out of evil) conduced much to the rectifying of them; and the pretended *Reformation from* the Church produced a true one in it. And if, after all this, ſome blemiſhes do ſtill remain, 1ſt. It muſt be conſidered; * That ſome things the Council could have wiſhed amended, and altered, which yet were too difficult to be brought about, without hazarding *ſchiſme* amongſt the *National* Churches, or Prelats, long inured to different Cuſtoms: And, * That ſeveral things alſo had dependence on the Reformation of the Secular Governours; which when the Council touched upon, though very tenderly, and drew up ſome Articles concerning it, but ſuch as were decreed both by former Church-Canons, and the Imperial Laws || preſently the *Princes* grew diſpleaſed: and ſo, for fear of alienating their minds to whoſe favours, otherwiſe, the Church ſtands much obliged, and by whoſe ſword (under the Divine Providence) ſhe is upheld, the Council was forced to bear with their *weakneſs*, and deſiſt from its purpoſe. Review the Councils complaint ſet down before, §. 210. — *Adeo dura, difficiliſq; eſt Præſentium temporum conditio* &c. 2ly Again; It may be conſidered; That ſeveral things, that were well ordered by the Council yet are not ſo well executed: nor ought the *Council* to be charged at all with this, but its *Miniſters*; who as they ſhall happen to be more, or leſs active, or piouſly diſpoſed, ſo its conſtitutions in all future ages will receive vigor, or languiſh; And, in this, Its *laws* do only ſuffer the common Fate of all others, made heretofore either in the *Eccleſiaſtical*, or *Civil*, States; No Court hitherto having been able to de- §. 244. || See *Soave*, *p.* 769. *Pallav. l.* 23. *c.* 4. *n.* 6.

vise a law, that could infallibly promote the *execution* of their *Laws*, or of *It self*. 3ly. After this, to be considered yet much more; that, if every thing, which *private judgments* (amongst which every one is to reckon his own) do think fit to be corrected, was not thought so by the Council, they ought rather, with an undisputing humility, to submit these to that of so Reverend an Assembly, than to censure it, as not conformable to theirs, and that too, as to matters, not received, or rejected by this Council, but after that all sides had been much disputed, and weighed. Especially they ought to ponder well these two things.

§. 245. 1. The one; Concerning the *Council* of *Trent* its differing in some practices from what was observed in the *antient* Church; That all the same *Constitutions* do not fit *all* times, where the circumstances of things are much varied, the former manners much relaxed, the Christian Profession much inlarged, the Civil Governments much altered, *&c.* Nor is one age of the world (no more, than of a man) in every thing, to be treated, as the precedent: Nor are the Distempers of Christianity in all times so agreeable in their nature, as to be cured still with the same Medicines: And several projects, that seem very beneficial in the Speculation, yet, in the Experience, and Practice, by not finding such an indifferent matter to work upon, as is supposed, would have a quite contrary effect; and, instead of better *order*, bring in *Confusion*, in removing what *good* was before, and being unable to establish any *thing* better; A thing often prest in the Council, in answer to those, who would have every thing restored according to the Model of *Antiquity*.

§. 246. 2. The other, concerning that *Supereminent power* in several particulars, which as it was found, so was left still, by the *Council*, in the hands of the *Bishop* of *Rome*; That, as by the *Church-Canons* anciently he hath possessed it, so it ought, if either, rather to be increased than any way diminished, in these later times: when the *Christian Churches* now much more inlarged, and extended, and seperated, under so many several *Secular* Heads, and so both by their bulk, and different temporal Interests, more subject to *divide*, and to fall a sunder, one from another, therefore we have much more need of a firm *union* in one Spiritual Head, and such Jurisdictions and Priviledges to be enjoyed by him, whereby *He* may have some influence upon the *whole Body*, and *It*, some necessary recourse to, and dependance on, *Him*. As we see in *Civil* States, how strictly upheld, and unviolably kept, are the *Prerogatives*, *Legislative*, *Dispensative*, *Donative*, Power of Princes, to keep the whole *Body* in a due dependance on a *Supreme*; and to secure the publick

publick peace, and happineſs, in the beſt of Goverments, a *Monarchical* Regency.

CHAP. XIII.

Solutions of the Proteſtant Objections.

Brief anſwers to the Proteſtant Objections made before, §. 3. *&c.* —§. 247. *&c.*

Where,

Of the Councils joyning Apoſtolical Tradition with the Holy Scriptures as a Ground of Church Definitions, §. 264.

§. 247.

HAving thus diſpatched the five Heads, which I intended to ſpeak of; I deſire you now to review the objections, which were propoſed in the beginning of this Diſcourſe (§. 3. *&c.*) againſt this Council; which, for the moſt part, I think, now will appear to you to have their main force and ſting already ſolved, and taken away.

To *α*. The words of *Bellarmine*, who is quoted *here* by the Archbiſhop, are not, *Ut ex omnibus Provinciis*; or (which is more) *from all particular Churches*, which the Archbiſhop ſaith: But —*Ut ſaltem ex majori parte Chriſtianarum Provinciarum aliqui conveniant.* See touching this matter, what is ſaid before, §. 35. *&c.* —65, 66, 67, 69. Whether a *Council* be *General*; or, in its obligation, *equivalent* thereto, much matters not; that Council is equivalent to a *General*, whoſe Decrees are *accepted* by the *much major* part, * of the Church-Catholick, or * of all particular Churches in it. Now the *Greek* Churches do agree wih the *Council* of *Trent*, in the chief points determined therein, againſt the *reformed*. †—Their Prelats alſo were invited in the General Summons; and the Council, or thoſe who called it, no cauſers of their abſence, but their great diſtance; their Preſent ſecular poverty, and oppreſſion: The open wars then between the *Turk* and *Chriſtendome*. Laſtly, the general accord and peace in their Churches, as to the *Trent Controverſies*.

To α.

†See 3. *Diſc.* §. 158, *&c.*

To *β*. See before, §. 70, 75, 77. The *paucity* of *Prelats* in ſome Seſſions (occaſioned by the long duration of the Council; by the

§. 249.

To *β*.

the wars, and jealousies of Princes, by the Bishops necessary defence of their several charges at home against the reformed, in *France*, and *Germany*) was abundantly recompenced * by the *ratification* of the Decrees of those *Sessions* by a very numerous, and unanimous Body assembled in the later end of the Council, and * by the *acceptation* of the *absent* Prelats, after the Council.

§. 249. To γ. To γ. See what hath been said, §. 47. &c. 80, 81. It was *called*, as General Councils ought, and use, to be: namely by the *Prime Patriarch*, and chief Ecclesiastical Person of Christianity, *presiding* in such Councils (as other inferiour Councils are also usually assembled by the Ecclesiastical Prelats presiding therein;) the *Emperour*, and much major part of *Christian Princes* consenting to it, desiring it, and sending their Bishops, and Orators, to it.

§. 250. To δ. To δ. This title [*representing the Church Universal*] (never used by any *General* Council, save only by *Constance*, and *Basil*, who also decreed a General Council its *superiority* to the Pope) was opposed by the Pope, or his Legats; not because he held not this Council to be *General*, or *Oecumenical*; for the title of it every where, with the Pope's approbation, runs,—*Hæc sacrosancta Oecumenica & Generalis Tridentina Synodus*; but because he held, no General *Council* whatever, neither that of *Trent*, nor that of *Nice*, to represent *the Universal Church, exclusively* to him; *i. e.* so as to have authority to conclude, and oblige the whole Church by its *Acts*, without these Acts first receiving their *confirmation* from the See Apostolick. That this only was the Controversie, see witnessed by *Soave*, p. 138. Now this: *whether the Acts of a General Council, unconfirmed by the Prime Patriarch of the Church, be valid?* the Dr. knows hath alwayes been a question among Roman Catholicks, and so hath that Proposition in him (*Hæres. 11. f. 9. n. 10.*) *Whether the Universal Church Representative understood so, as not including the Apostolick See, may erre?* —Or, *Whether the testimony of an Oecumenical Council, understood exclusively to the Apostolick See, be the testimony of the whole Church?* Which question as some of the French Church seem to affirm, so other Churches deny; neither was it decided in the Council of *Trent* (of which see what is said before, §. 155.) but yet, *de facto*, the Pope's Confirmation was desired by this Council (see the last Act, Sess. 25.) Neither doth this thing concern the Council of *Trent* more than any other General Council: Nor is the deciding of this question material to the Protestants concerning any such Council, whose *Acts* are confirmed by the Pope; in which the stating of this question surely is needless; whether such acts are also *of force without* the Pope?

To ε.

§. 251.

To ε. See what is ſaid, §. 67, 64. Neither doth the *abſence* of Proteſtant Clergie, ſuch as are *not Biſhops*, diſauthorize the Council; for ſuch have no right to ſit, or vote in it: Nor the *voluntary abſence* of Proteſtant Biſhops, if invited; if ſecured, as they were. † Nor, laſtly, the *excluſion*, or non-admittance of them; if guilty of *Tenents* cenſured and *condemned* by former lawful *Councils*: as many of the former Proteſtant Doctrines were: || The ſeveral cauſes, alledged by Proteſtants for abſenting themſelves, have been ſhewed in this diſcourſe not *ſufficient*, or ſatisfactory, from §. 82. to §. 122. and from §. 159. to §. 172.

To ε. † See §. 68. 82. &c. 92.

|| See §. 198.

To ζ. review the anſwer to ε. See the reaſon of the abſence of the French Biſhops in ſome Seſſions, no way chargable on the Council, or on the non-freedom thereof, before, §. 70 *&c.*

To ζ.

§ 252.

To η. See what is ſaid, §. 167. where is ſhewed; that the *nearneſs*, and non-impediment of the Italian Biſhops by reaſon of the *freedom* of that Country from *Lutheraniſme*, and not any particular intereſt of theirs, thwarting the proceedings of the Council, was the true cauſe of their being ſo *numerous*. That the abſence of other Biſhops was culpable, but no way, their preſence: that the much major part of them were *Subjects* to *other Princes* (the Emperor, King of *Spain*; Duke of *Florence*; the State of *Venice*, &c.) not the *Pope*; and did manifeſtly in the Council follow and adhere to their *Intereſts*, and *Inſtructions*, in ſeveral matters. That, as to the *Proteſtant Controverſies*, the Pope had no need of their aſſiſtance againſt the reſt, the whole Council in theſe *unanimouſly* according: and that, as to the conteſts between the *Epiſcopal* and *Papal* Rights, many of them ſided againſt him; which is every where ſhewed alſo in *Soave's* Hiſtory deſcribing the great perplexities, and Artifices of the Pope, and his Legats, in preſerving his pretended priviledges, and not that they might be *confirmed* or aſſerted by the *Council*; but that, not *diminiſhed* or voted down by it. Laſtly, that, however ſuch a number of *Italian Biſhops* might hinder ſomething, prejudicial to the Pope, from being voted in the Council; yet were they *inſufficient* alone to vote any thing, or to paſs any *Decree*, at leaſt in matter of Doctrine, againſt the reſt: becauſe no ſuch things were valid, a conſiderable part diſſenting; as the *non-Italian*, or alſo the Biſhops of any one greater *Nation*, were granted to be.

To η.

To θ. See what is ſaid, §. 39. *&c.* 67. An *univerſal* Acceptation by all Churches of the Acts of a Council, to render them obliging, is *not neceſſary*; for ſo none would be valid, wherein the Doctrines of any *Church* are cenſured.

To θ.

To κ.

§ 253. To κ. See what is said, §. 77. Both the *Eccleſiaſtical*, and *Civil* State of *France* accepted the *Trent Decrees* as to matter of Doctrine; the things, wherein Proteſtants chiefly oppoſe it. The Eccleſiaſtical State of *France* accepted, and petitioned the King and Civil State to receive, this Council alſo in points of *Diſcipline*. And if the *Civil* State received it not in every thing, I mean, ſo far, as it medled not with their *temporal* rights, I think, it appears, from the former Juſtification of the *Legality* of this Council, that they cannot be freed from fault: Neither, if that State refuſe theſe Canons of Diſcipline, will it juſtifie the *Proteſtants* for refuſing the reſt, of Doctrine: unleſs the French plead the Council totally illegal, as they do not; neither will it juſtifie the *Proteſtants*, at leaſt, in refuſing theſe; if the *French* do, *faultily*, refuſe them.

To κ.

§. 254. *n.* 1. To λ. See what is ſaid, from §. 113. to §. 127. where is ſhewed. 1ſt *As to the Biſhops*; That the ſame plea hath been uſually made againſt *former* Councils by the *Hereticks*, they condemned. That the Chriſtian world was divided into *Arrians*, and *Anti-Arrians* before the *Council* of *Nice*, as it was into *Catholicks*, and *Proteſtants* before that of *Trent*; and the *Arrians* were many waies proceeded againſt, before the aſſembling of that Council, by ſome of thoſe *Biſhops*; who yet afterward ſat in Council as their *Judges*; and the Anti-Arrian Biſhops only, as the *major number*, condemned the other. That the *Church-Governours*, whatever their perſwaſions are formerly known to be in the controverſie propoſed, cannot be removed from the *Tribunal*, for the deciding *purely eccleſiaſtical*, and ſpiritual, matters; and this is only neceſſary (not, to ſee, whether they *ſide* any way, or own a party; but only) to ſee on which ſide is the *major* part: *That in cauſes of Religion, in which all men are concerned*, and the Clergie eſpecially ſtand obliged earneſtly to defend the truth, and oppoſe Novelties, and are culpable in remaining neuters, and omitting this duty (to uſe Mr. *Chillingworths* words) *it is in a manner impoſsible to be avoided*, but that the *Judge* muſt be, ſome way or other, a *party*; if he may be called a party, who hath formerly declared himſelf of ſuch an opinion. But, if their being queſtioned of judging in their own cauſe, relate not here to matters of *opinion*, but of *honour*, or *profit*; then, for moſt matters defined in the Council of *Trent*, its judgment cannot be declined on this *later account*, being given in matters, meerly *ſpeculative*, or at leaſt, far remote from ſuch *Secular* concernments.

To λ.

2ly *As to the Pope*: That the ſame things may be repeated for *him*, as for the *Biſhops*. That Popes have often *preſided* by their

their Legats in former allowed Councils, when they were *accuſed*, and excepted againſt, by thoſe perſons, for the judging of whoſe cauſe the *Council* was convened: As *Celeſtine*, excepted againſt by *Neſtorius*, preſided in the *Third*, and *Leo*, by *Dioſcorus*, in the Fourth, General Council. That it is thought moſt reaſonable, that the ſupreme *Civil* Judge, either by himſelf, or his Subſtitutes, be the Judge of all thoſe cauſes, which concern his *own Rights*, when there is a controverſie in theſe between him, and ſome of his Subjects. That, if the Pope, for defects in his *Office*, or other perſonal faults, be liable to any *other* Judge, it muſt be to the *Council*. Now by this Council he remaineth either cleared, or not condemned, as to the Accuſations of Proteſtants.

§. 254. n. 2. This having ever been the chief plea for thoſe, who foreſee, that they ſhall be over-numbred, and over-voted in a *Council* to alledge it to conſiſt of a *contrary Party*; and ſo to decline its judgment (for, uſually, no *Council* happens to be called for ſuppreſſing any new Doctrine, till a conſiderable oppoſition is firſt made by thoſe Paſtors of the Church againſt ſuch Doctrine, who alſo are the proper *Judges* of it) I think it not amiſs, in the laſt place, to give you the judgment of Proteſtants themſelves touching the *inſufficiency* of ſuch an *excuſe*, when (by God's providence) it happened afterward to be their own caſe, in, I think, the moſt noted, and general Synod, that hath been held amongſt them ſince the *Reformation*; I mean, the *Synod* at *Dort*, aſſembled, *A. D.* 1618. Wherein were preſent *Delegates* from the King of *England*, Elector *Palatine*, *Landgrave* of *Heſs*, the four Proteſtant-Cantons of the *Swiſſes*, the Commonwealth of *Geneva*, *&c.* For ſome time, great Controverſie had been in the Low-Countries concerning the high points of Predeſtination, Grace, and Freewill; the *Paſtors* there divided into *Remonſtrants*, and *Contra-Remonſtrants*, the conteſt proceeding ſo far in ſeveral places, as to a ſeperation of Communion. Upon it this National Synod is called, and the *Remonſtrants* in this of *Dort*, foreſeeing themſelves in the ſame condition, as the *Proteſtants* did in that of *Trent*, defend themſelves with the ſame Arts and Excuſes: † Alledged, that the Synod, excepting the Forrainers, did moſtly conſiſt (a thing which could not be denied) of an already declared *contrary Party*, who, it was unreaſonable, that they ſhould ſit *Judges* in their *own* cauſe; a party too, who had before alſo ſeparated themſelves from communicating with the Remonſtrants; and amongſt other things, thoſe Remonſtrants did particularly inſiſt upon this very plea, we are now ſpeaking to, of the Proteſtants againſt the Council of *Trent*; which was held juſtly to exempt them from any obligation to its *Decrees*.

† See *Acta Synod Dordrecht. Seſſ.* 25.

They

They required alſo a Synod, as the Proteſtants did in the time of that of *Trent*, In which a *ſet* and *equal* number on either ſide might be choſen to conſider, how to *accommodate*, rather than *decide*, theſe Controverſies: After which, any *Clergy* diſſenting, being only removed from their places, might ſtill enjoy the ſame *liberty* of *conſcience* as others: For that, ſince the *Apoſtles*, there was no ſuch infallible Guidance of the Holy Spirit, but that Modern Synods might *erre*; as ſeveral Ancient had done. †

† See Synod Delf. Seſſ. 26.

In anſwer to this; the Synod defends it ſelf (all the forrain aſſiſtants thereof concurring in their judgment) with ſuch replies as theſe, Than which, only changing the name, I cannot imagine a better *juſtification* of the *Council* of *Trent*. 1ſt Concerning the members of the Synod, their being of a contrary perſwaſion, and ſo a Party, and Judges; They ſay (ſee *Acta Synod. Dordr. Seſſ.* 26. p. 84. *Nunquam praxin hanc Eccleſiarum fuiſſe, ut, Paſtores, quoties exorientibus erroribus, ex officio ſeſe opponerent* [as the *Tridentine* Biſhops, before that Council, did] *propterea jure ſuffragiorum, aut de illis ipſis erroribus judicandi poteſtate, excideret. Ita enim omnem everti judiciorum Eccleſiaſticorum ordinem; efficiq;, ne Paſtores officio ſuo fideliter fungi queant.* Again, p. 88.—*Eos, qui in doctrinâ aut moribus ſcandalorum authores ſunt, ſemper Cenſores ſuos, Conſiſtoria, Claſſes, Synodos, ſeu partem adverſam, rejicere.—Ad eum modum, Arrianis aliiſq; olim hæreticis, adverſus Orthodoxos Paſtores ſemper licuiſſet excipere.* And,—*Quo pacto* (ſay they) *iis Paſtores ſe neutros, ut loquuntur, præbebunt* (*Quando præſertim tam multi anni intercedunt, priuſquam legitimum & publicum Eccleſiæ judicium obtineri poteſt*) *quum Deus illis præcipiat, ut ſerio Doctrinæ ſinceritati attendant.*

§. 254. n. 3.

The *Engliſh Divines* there deliver their judgment alſo in the ſame caſe very ſolidly.—*Non valet* (ſay they) *ad Synodi hujus*, [but ſuppoſe they had ſaid *Tridentinæ*] *authoritatem enervandam, quod cauſentur Remonſtrantes maximam Synodi partem conſtare ex adverſariis ſuis: Neq; naturale jus permittere, ut, qui adverſarius eſt, in cauſâ ſuâ judex ſedeat.* 1. *Nam huic ſententiæ refragatur primo perpetua praxis omnium Eccleſiarum. Nam in Synodis Oecumenicis, Nicæno, &c. ii, qui antiquitus receptam doctrinam oppugnarunt, ab illis, qui eandem ſibi traditam admiſerunt approbarunt, examinati judicati, damnati, ſunt.* 2. *Ipſius rei neceſſitas huc cogit. Theologi enim, in negocio Religionis, neq; eſſe ſolent tanquam abraſa tabulæ, neq; eſſe debent. Si igitur ſoli neutrales poſſunt eſſe Judices, extra Eccleſiam, in quâ lites enatæ ſunt, quærendi eſſent.* 3. *Ipſa æquitas hoc ſuadere videtur. Nam quæ ratio reddi poteſt, ut ſuffragiorum jure priventur omnes illi Paſtores, qui, ex officio, receptam Eccleſiæ doctrinam propugnantes, ſecus docentibus adverſati ſunt. Si hoc obtinuerit, nova dogmata ſpargentibus nemo obſiſteret, ne, ipſo facto, jus omne*

ne poſtmodum de illis controverſiis judicandi amitteret. Enough of this.

2. Again: For the *juſt* and *obliging* authority of this Council, and the *Credibility*, at leaſt of its not erring, they urge. † — *Chriſtum Dominum, qui Apoſtolis promiſit ſpiritum veritatis, Eccleſiæ quoque ſuæ pollicitum eſſe, ſe cum eâ uſque ad finem ſæculi manſurum*, Matt. 28. 20. And, — *Ubi duo, aut tres in ipſius nomine congregati fuerint, ſe in eorum medio futurum*, Matt. 18. 20. They urge the precept of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 14. 29, 31. — *Ut judicetur de iis, quæ Prophetæ loquuntur*: And, — *Prophetarum Spiritus prophetis ſubjecti ſint.* And the *Geneva* Divines, *Seſſ.* 29. urge alſo, — *Dic Eccleſia*, — and — *Si Eccleſiam non audiverit*, &c. §. 254. n. 4 † See *Seſſ.* 26. *Syn. Delf.*

3ly. In defence of the *Proteſtants* refuſing ſubmiſſion to the Judgment of the *Council* of *Trent*, becauſe it was a party, without their allowing the ſame priviledge to the *Remonſtrants*, for that of *Dort*, they anſwer, — || *Valde diſparem eſſe hanc comparationem. Illos enim* [the Remonſtrants, and *Contra*-Remonſtrants] *eidem ſubeſſe Magiſtratui.* And, — *Remonſtrantes membra eſſe Eccleſiarum Belgicarum, & Reformatarum.* See the ſame ſaid again, Seſſ. 26. p. 85. But, according to this anſwer, the reaſon, why the Proteſtants denied their ſubmiſſion to the Conncil of *Trent* muſt not be, becauſe it conſiſted of an *adverſe party*, but becauſe all its members were not *Subjects* of the *ſame* Prince; a thing never alledged before. But here I ask, Is there then, no preſervation of the Churches unity by Synods, no ſubordination of Clergy, no rule of one party, the Superior and Major, judging another, the Inferior and Minor, any further, than only in ſuch little parcels of the Church, as happen to live under the ſame Secular Governours? Are our *Lords Promiſes*, and, *Dic Eccleſia*, all confin'd to theſe? What will become of the Authority of *Oecumenical* and *Patriarchal* Councils? Why not in theſe alſo one Eccleſiaſtical major Party judge another, as well as in that of *Dort*? *Credo unam, Catholicam, Eccleſiam*: How this Church *One*, if united in no one common Government and Subjection? But if it be: here alſo one party muſt judge another; and ſo the *Proteſtants* alledging the Council of *Trent* an adverſe *Party*, availes them nothing, as to the *annulling* of its *Judgment*. But, as the Remonſtrants, yet further replied † If, at leaſt, of the Clergy living under the ſame Secular Government one adverſe Party may judge the other, then may a Synod of the Catholick Clergy in *France* oblige the Proteſtant Clergy there to ſtand to their ſentence: To this, therefore, the *Synod* ſhapes another anſwer, as me ſeems no better, than the former: That all Proteſtants are freed from being tryed or §. 254. n. 5. || *Seſſ.* 25. p. 82. † See *Synod. Delf. Seſſ.* 26

judged by the Popiſh party in Synods, For that—† *Primi Eccleſiæ Reformatores pro Doctoribus Eccleſiæ Pontificiæ haberi noluerunt, ſed contra ab iis ſeceſſionem fecerunt.* Again, *Ibid.*—*Iſti nunquam Eccleſiæ Pontificiæ Doctores cenſeri voluerunt, ſicuti Hi* [*i. e.* the Remonſtrants] *pro Eccleſiæ Reformatæ Doctoribus haberi cupiunt.* So alſo the *Geneva Divines*, *Seſſ.* 29. deliver their judgment,—*Licuit* (ſay they) *noſtris proteſtari adverſus Concilium Conſtantienſe, & Tridentinum: quia non profitemur unionem cum illis: Imo illam aſpernamur, & averſamur.* But, I ſay: doth our *renouncing*, and profeſſing to have no *communion* with a lawful, *Superior Eccleſiaſtical Authority* preſently, in juſtice, free us from it? For example, the Presbyter *Arius* his renouncing communion with the *Biſhop* of *Alexandria*? or the Presbyter *Luther*, with his *Eccleſiaſtical Superiors* in *Saxony*? Is there not a due ſubordination both of perſons and Synods, from the loweſt to the higheſt, as well in *ſeveral*, as in the *ſame* ſecular Governments, to preſerve the unity of the *Church* not only *Belgick*, or *Brittannick*, but *Catholick*? Which gradual Authority all thoſe are obliged to obey, and conform to, and are liable to its cenſures; not who voluntarily profeſs obedience, but who truly, according to the Churches Canons, do owe it; as the Proteſtants did to that of *Trent*, and owe it not a whit the leſs for their declaring againſt it: Elſe ſo many as will venture to be *ſchiſmaticks*, and divide, will put themſelves out of the reach of the Churches Spiritual Courts; And, had the Remonſtrants, to their ſuppoſed innovation in doctrine, added a ſeparation in communion from the reſt of the Belgick Clergy, the Contra-Remonſtrants, they had, by this ſecond fault, freed themſelves from having been either juſtly tryed or cenſured by the Synod: and their declaring once,—*Non profitemur unionem cum vobis: immo illam aſpernamur, & averſamur*, would have voided all the counter-actings of the *Synod* of *Dort*; as theſe *Dort-Divines* ſay, the Reformed's like Proteſtation did, thoſe of *Trent*.

Conc. Delf in Act. a Dordrecht, Seſſ. 6.

§. 255. To μ. ‖ See §. 198.

To μ. See what is ſaid, §. 125. *Leo* the Tenth did no wrong in declaring the Proteſtant-tenents Hereſies, if ſeveral of them were condemned by ſeveral allowed Councils, ‖ and conſequently the maintainers of them, were *Hereticks*: Yet is it uſual for Councils, and other Courts of Judicature, to *reiterate* their *ſentence* ſo often, as offenders reiterate the ſame faults, or revive the ſame errors: And therefore was this done in *Trent*.

§. 256. To ν.

To ν. See §. 83, 92. The *place* of the *Council* was choſen by the conſent of moſt Chriſtian Princes: no place could be appointed of an equal convenience for all Countries: the place was under the *Emperours* power, as himſelf often declared; not acceſſible

ceſſible by the *Popes* forces; and ſecure enough to the *main* Body of *Proteſtants*, thoſe of *Germany*; from which *place* alſo their forces, when time was, frighted the Council: Laſtly, nearer to them than to the Catholicks of *Spain*, and *France*. A *Safe-conduct* alſo the Proteſtants had, as large, as could juſtly be deſired; and the *Exceptions* they took againſt it, were unreaſonable. Of which ſee before, §. 104. The Council of *Conſtance* is alſo much wronged, and the proceedings thereof againſt *Jo. Huſs* miſrelated: Of which ſee before, §. 101. The *Divines* alſo that, upon the Safe-conduct, came to the Council of *Trent*, were courteouſly treated, and diſmiſſed; though the deſigns of thoſe Princes, that ſent them thither, were treacherous, and bloody. †

† §. 68, 90. §. 257.

To ξ. The whole abode of the *Proteſtant Divines* of *Trent*, from their firſt coming to their departure, was but in all about a *Fortnights* time; after which ſhort time the Proteſtant *Princes*, unexpectedly, appeared in *Arms*. Though it is true alſo, that at their coming one of the Legats his accidentally falling ſick of a diſeaſe, of which he died within a few weeks, ſomewhat retarded the buſineſs of treating with them; the manner of which treaty required much deliberation. Laſtly, by their *printing* the *defence* of their tenents the Fathers of the Council heard ſufficiently what they could ſay; yet were no way *ſweyed* with their *Arguments*,

To ξ.

To π. See §. 68. *n.* 2. and what is ſaid before to λ. To refer the judgment of *Spiritual* matters to *Lay-perſons*, as more indifferent; or to change the former ordinary Eccleſiaſtical *Judges* of ſuch Controverſies, becauſe theſe are fore-known to be of a *contrary* opinion to thoſe, who are to appear before their Tribunal is ſhewed before, §. 254. to be a moſt unreaſonable demand. Neither, if ſuch thing had been granted, could it have advantaged the *Proteſtants*: For, whether their Judge had been the *whole*, and not only the Epiſcopal, *Clergy*, or *Secular Princes*, or *People*; a *major* part of all theſe, they knew, to be *Catholick*, and of a belief oppoſit to theirs. † And, whom their writings had hitherto not changed, or perſwaded, why ſhould they think their diſcourſe, or diſputes would? Laſtly; an *equal* number on both ſides, without any umpirage, appointed to be their Judges, is a *Court*, that, where either party is reſolute, can proceed to no ſentence. They, who foreſee a major part of thoſe, to whom our Lord hath committed the Government, and guidance of his Church, oppoſing their Doctrine, are already ſelf-condemned, as to Authority; and ought not to *ſeek* a *new Judge*, but *reform* their *errors*.

§. 258.

To π.

† See before §. 115. *n.* 2. §. 118. *&c.*

§. 259. To §.

To §. See what is ſaid, §. 105. To ſhew, that this *Oath* was not given in any prejudice to the freedom of the Council, for 1ſt. It was only an oath uſed at *Ordinations*, not new framed for, or impoſed on, the Council at *Trent*. It, or the like was *anciently* taken by the Biſhops when ordained, without being thought prejudicial to the *liberty* of *former Councils*. 2. Again an Oath it was only obliging to a legal obedience due by the Divine, or Church-laws (an Oath to this purpoſe being taken alſo by Proteſtant Biſhops;) and ſo, ſtrengthning only that engagement of Biſhops to the obſervance of theſe laws, which they had before, when yet unſworn. So that, notwithſtanding ſuch Oath, they might queſtion any Papal *pretended* right, which they thought not *Canonical*: As alſo it is clear they freely did, without any thought, or jealouſie, of their treſpaſſing againſt this Oath, and without the Pope's Legats objecting it to them. 3. Again; neither did ſuch Oath, in ſuch a ſence, reſtrain them to obſervance of the *Canons*; as that now, when in a conjunct Body, and the See Apoſtolick concurring, they might not alſo abrogate, and change the ſame Canons, as thought fit. 4 However; An Oath it was laying no *reſtraint* upon the *Councils liberty*, as to voting any way concerning moſt of the *Proteſtant Controverſies*: unleſs perhaps that of the *Popes Supremacy*. 5. Again, If this Oath binding them to any thing thought unlawful, their learning well enough knew, they were, without any *Diſpenſation*, obliged to break, not keep, it; and that in an unlawful ingagement, every one is free from it, as ſoon as he knows it ſuch, 6. Laſtly, this Oath being taken generally by all, how come the *French*, and *Spaniſh* Biſhops to be ſaid to have acted ſo diverſly from the *Italian* Biſhops, if *all* were ſo ſtraightly tyed, by the *ſame Oath*, to the *Popes* intereſt.

As for what is ſaid,—*That none had ſuffrage in this Council, but ſuch as were profeſt enemies to all, that called for Reformation, or a free Council*: Here, ſince it cannot be denied; that all the Biſhops, preſent in *Trent*, had *Suffrages*, none excluded, it is by the Objectors confeſſed, that not only a Major part, but the *whole* Council of *Trent*, was an enemy to the *Reformation*; and the Pope, as to all thoſe Points, that proceeded ſingly againſt them, ſecure enough of a *full* vote, without the multiplying of *Italian*, or *Titular*, or *Penſionary*, Biſhops.

§. 260. To σ. 1

To σ. 1 See §. 160 The *propoſal* of the *Legats* could alter nothing in the Councils votes as to the things that were propoſed; eſpecially as to thoſe *Proteſtant* Controverſies, wherein they unanimouſly agreed; but only could hinder ſome things from being *voted*, becauſe

cauſe not *propoſed*, But no Proteſtant Controverſies are found ſo omitted. Again, ſuch Propoſal ſeems very neceſſary for *order* ſake; nor was any way uſed by the Legats to abridge the deſires of any conſiderable part of the Council concerning any proponends, as is amply ſhewed, See §. 164 §. 160.

§. 261 To σ. Things were firſt conſulted on, and voted in *Trent*, not at *Rome*; the *Pope* uſually advertiſed of their Conſultations, after the judgment of the *Congregations* already paſſed, returned *Inſtructions* to his Legats, before the *General Seſſions*, concerning his opinion of the matter in hand; and commendable had it been, and advantageous to the Synod, could the *Biſhops*, or *Metropolitans* of each *Province* have done the like to their Repreſentatives. *Celeſtine*, and *Leo* declared their judgments to the third and fourth General Council, not to give a law to them, but advice. If the *Pope's Inſtructions* to his Legats concerning any Points to be handled in Council were lawful *before* the Council, why not *during* it: Eſpecially the matters being ſo various, as that the *Legats* were not capable of ſuch Inſtructions all at once; neither did this encroach on the *liberty* of the Council: unleſs it can be ſhewed, that the Council was obliged to *follow* it; which, it is clear, they were not, becauſe, *de facto*, they many times oppoſed it. Neither was any thing in matter of Doctrine voted in Council, whatever inſtructions came in the male from *Rome*, a conſiderable part *reſiſting*. To σ.

§. 262. To τ. See what is ſaid, §. 170, 171. The Popes *Penſions* given to ſome poorer Biſhops, during ſo long a Seſſion of the Council, might be an effect of his *charity*, not *policy*. However, it is clear, that their aſſiſtance to him was uſeleſs as to *Proteſtant* Controverſies; and ſtood him in little ſtead as to thoſe *Catholick* ones, wherein a conſiderable part of the Council oppoſed him; none of which were paſſed for him; if any perhaps were hindred by his party from being paſſed againſt him, this was the uttermoſt of any ſervice, done by his Penſioners. As for many *Titular Biſhops* ſent, and *new* Biſhopricks erected, during the Council, whilſt thoſe things are only in general ſaid, and no particulars named, they carry the ſuſpicion of a groundleſs report. To τ.

§. 263. To υ. The Councils determining things *repugnant* to *Scripture*. That no injunction *repugnant* to the *Holy Scriptures* is to be obeyed, is on all ſides agreed on: But, that ſome of the Councils decrees are contrary to the Scriptures, as it is a thing affirmed by the *Proteſtants*, the leſſer; ſo is it denied by the *Council*, and its *adherents*, much the major part of the Doctors and Church-Governours of the Weſt. We are to ſeek then, which of them, our *duty* doth oblige us to *obey*, and follow. To υ.

Next

Next, As to the Councils determining things *not warranted by Scripture*, See before, §. 176. the two Propositions (both Divine Revelation) whereby the Scriptures warrant the Church, in her defining, and requiring a belief of, such things to be *lawful*, and in her injoyning such things to be *practised*, as the Holy Scriptures have not *prohibited*, or declared against. This warrant from the Scriptures, for any of their Decrees, the *Council* wants not: and affirms no further warrant from them, as to such Decrees, necessary.

§. 264. To Φ. I answer. 1st, That the Council of *Trent* allows no *Tradition, extra Scripturas*, or unwritten there, to be sufficient ground of defining matter of faith, unless it be Tradition *Apostolical*.—*Traditiones* (saith It) † *quæ ex ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ ad nos usque pervenerunt.*—And ‖—*Vult S. Synodus quod causa controversa secundum sacram Scripturam, & Apostolorum Traditiones &c. in predicto Concilio tractentur.*

† See *Sess.* 4. *Decret. de Canon Scrip.*

‖ *Salv. Conduct. Sess.* 15.

2ly That any Council should make the *word of God* delivered by the Apostles either by Tradition written (the Holy Scriptures) or unwritten (*i. e.* by them,) *equally* a ground of Faith where there is a certainty, equal, or sufficient, of the *one*, as of the *other*, that it is *Apostolical*, I see not, how it can be liable to any Censure.—Of this thus Mr. *Stillingfleet*, †—*Your next inquiry is to this sense: Whether Apostolical Tradition be not then as credible, as the Scriptures? I answer freely: (supposing it equally evident,) what was delivered by the Apostles to the Church by word, or writing, hath equal Credibility.* [As for the *necessity* of *standing Records*, which he there alledgeth, from the speedy decay of an *Orall Tradition*; this is sufficiently remedied, if the Apostles Successors at least do commit to writing things which were by them orally received]. And thus Mr. *Chillingw.*† —*We conceive no antipathy between God's Word written, and unwritten, but that both might stand very well together,—If God had pleased, he might so have disposed it, that part might have been written, and part unwritten: but then he would have taken order, to whom we should have had recourse for that part of it, which was not written* [So he hath, sending us to our spiritual Guides, † who do, by Tradition of their Predecessors writings convey [illegible] to us that right sence of Scriptures, which is dubious in the written letter of them.]

† p. 210.

† *Heb.* 13.7, 17.—*Eph.* 4. 11, 14.

3ly. None can rationally deny, that the *Traditive* Doctrine of the *Church-Guides* would have been a *sufficient* ground of our *faith*, had the *Scriptures* not been written, because it was so, before they were written; and is so still to some, who cannot read them written; or know, that others

read

read them right. Of this alſo thus Mr. *Stillingf.* † —*It is evident from the nature of the thing, that the writing of a divine Revelation is not neceſſary for the ground, and reaſon of faith, as to that revelation: Becauſe men may believe a Divine Revelation without it; as is not only evident in the caſe of the Patriarchs, but of all thoſe, who in the time of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, did believe the truth of the Doctrine of Chriſt, before it was written,—and this is ſtill the caſe of all illiterate perſons, who cannot reſolve their faith properly into the Scripture, but into the Doctrine delivered them out of the Scripture.* † *p.* 208.

4ly We find the firſt General Councils, univerſally allowed, to have grounded their Decrees upon the Argument of *Tradition*, and the Doctrine, or *Interpretation*, of *Scriptures*, deſcended to them from former ages, as well as upon the Text of Scriptures; and by both theſe, not one of them ſingly, to have defended their cauſe againſt *Hereticks*. Of which thus *Athanaſius*. † —*Ecce nos demonſtramus iſtiuſmodi ſententiam à Patribus ad Patres, quaſi per manus, traditam eſſe,*—and,—*In eo Concilio illa ſunt ſcripta, quæ ab initio ipſi, qui Teſtes oculati, & Miniſtri verbi fuere, tradiderunt. Fides enim quæ ſcriptis, decretisq; Synodi ſancita eſt, ea eſt totius Eccleſiæ.* And, || —*Ego arbitrabar omnium (quotquot unquam fuere) hæreticorum inanem garrulitatem, Nicæno Concilio ſedatam eſſe. Nam fides, quæ inibi à Patribus, ſecundum ſacras Scripturas, tradita, & confeſſionibus confirmata eſt, ſatis mihi idonea, efficaxq; videbatur ad omnem impietatem evertendam, & pietatem ejus, quæ in Chriſto eſt, fidei conſtituendam.* † *Synodi Nicenæ decreta.* || *Epiſtol. ad Epictetum.*

5ly. Proteſtants, in ſome point of faith, ground their belief only, or at leaſt ſufficiently, on Tradition † namely in this: *That the Scriptures are God's Word*; and conſequently muſt allow any other Tradition of *equal* evidence a ſufficient ground of any other *Article* of *Faith*; and ſo do,—*When you can produce* (ſaith Mr. *Stillingf.* ||) *as certain evidence of any Apoſtolical Tradition diſtinct from Scripture, as we can do, that the Books of Scripture were delivered by the Apoſtles to the Church, you may then be hearkned to.* And Mr. *Chillingworth*, † —*Prove your whole Doctrine by ſuch a Tradition* [as that by which the Scripture is proved to be God's Word] *and we will yield to you in all things.* † *Stillingf. Pt.* 1 *c.* 7. || *p.* 210. † *p.* 73.

6ly Tradition, unwritten in Scripture, is either a delivery of ſomething *not contained* in Scripture, or the expoſition, or delivery of the *true ſenſe* of what is contained there: The latter ſort of which Traditions the Church much more makes uſe of, and vindicates, than the former (ſee *Diſc.* 2. §. 40. *n.* 2.) Again, both theſe Traditions are either only *orall*, (in which is the leſs certainty,) or alſo committed to *writing* by the Apoſtles Succeſſors. Now an *unanimous Tradition* of the *ſence* of Scriptures

tures found in the *writings* of the *Fathers*, is also often pretended to be made use of by *Protestants* as the ground of their *faith*, where the sence of Scripture is in dispute. For, if we ask them, whether the letter of Scripture only, or the sence, is that which they believe, and call *Gods word*, or divine Revelation; they answer, that they believe the *sence* of it to be so: If asked again, in Scriptures of dubious interpretation, why they believe *this* to be the sence, not *another*; they answer, because this by primitive Tradition is delivered to be the sence of it; which Tradition, so *early*, so *universal*, &c. they believe to have descended from the *Apostles*. 7ly Concerning, what Traditions have the Evidence of Apostolical (as Protestants grant some have) what not, I know no other authorized, or also fitter, *judge*, than the *Council*; nor any other way, that the *Church* can deliver her Judgment in them, than by her *Councils*. And, if Councils are to Judge, what Traditions are such, the same Councils may proceed, where they find these clear, to ground their *decrees* on them, as such. This is said to shew: that *Traditions*, if evidently Apostolical, are a *sufficient* ground of faith; that some Traditions are granted to be *evidently* so; and, that private Christians depend on the *Churches* Judgment, which are so; That ancient allowed Councils have used the Argument of *Tradition*, as well as of *Scripture*, to disprove the verity of their *Definitions*; and for these reasons, the Council of *Trent* † seems not culpable, if using the same as a ground for her defining Controversies, *de fide*. 8. But, 8ly I know no *definition* of the Council of *Trent* in any matter of faith, that is opposed by *Protestants*, which is not pretended to be grounded on the *Divine Scriptures*: On these *Scriptures*, either, if it be in speculative points of faith, *revealing* it; Or, if in matter of practice, either *commanding*, or *not prohibiting* it: This latter being enough for an obliging of that assent, or belief, which the Council requires, *viz.* that the thing, not so prohibited, is *lawful*. 9. Lastly, where ever the Protestants for the points in Controversie press the Council of *Trents* defining them from pretended Tradition, not only *extra*, but, *contra*, *Scripturam* [speaking of the true sence thereof] the Catholicks freely joyn with them; that, where any Tradition is not said, but proved contrary to Scripture (*i. e.* the pretended Apostolick *unwritten* Tradition contrary to the *written*) such *unwritten* Tradition is to be rejected, the other followed.

† Sess. 4.

§. 265. To χ. To χ. That nothing, as matter of *faith*, was defined by the Council of *Trent*, which hath not descended from, and is not warranted by, *Apostolical* Tradition, is as constantly affirmed by

by Catholiks, as denied by *Proteſtants*. That nothing is maintained by the Council as Apoſtolical Tradition, that is repugnant to what is unanimouſly delivered in the *writings* of the firſt 300 years is alſo aſſerted by *Catholicks*, as the contrary is pretended by *Proteſtants*. But that nothing is, or may be pretended Apoſtolical Tradition, but what can be ſhewed unanimouſly delivered in the foreſaid *writings* (as if all that deſcended to poſterity muſt needs be, in them, ſo *few*, ſo *ſhort*, ſet down, and regiſtred) this as Proteſtants alledge it a *juſt*, ſo Catholicks hold it *too ſhort* a, meaſure, by which to examine Traditions Apoſtolical. This for *matters* of *faith*; as for other things decreed, or injoyned by the Council to be practiſed; and ſo conſequently, this to be believed of them, that the *practice* thereof is *lawful*; it is not neceſſary, that ſuch things be warranted by *Apoſtolical* Tradition, but only, that they cannot be ſhewed repugnant to it.

To Ψ. See what hath been ſaid at large in ſatisfaction to this great complaint, from §. 173. to § 203. Where is ſhewed, that the *Lutheran's* many erroneous opinions in matter of faith ingaged the Council to ſo many contrary definitions; and that it is no wonder, if the Decrees of this Council were a ſumme of former Church Doctrine, and Tradition; as Lutheraniſme was a complex of former errors (probably, the *laſt*, and *greateſt* attempt, that ſhall be made againſt the *Catholick* Faith:) and that, for the Councils making ſo many Anathema's, it is only their blame, who have broached, or revived ſo many dangerous Tenents. That this Council hath inſerted no *new Article* into the former *Creeds*; though no juſt cauſe can be alledged, why this Council (only, if ſuppoſed a General one) might not have done ſo, had they thought fit, 1. no former *Canon* of any Council (not that of *Epheſus* See §. 77) having *prohibited* ſuch a thing. 2 No former *Canon*, that prohibits ſuch a thing, being *valid*, or juſtly *preſcribing* to a ſucceeding Council of *equal* authority. That for its making new Definitions in matters of Faith; and for its requiring aſſent to, or belief of, them under *Anathema*, or *Excommunication*, it is, if a crime, a common one to it with all other former *allowed Councils*, even the four firſt: and that the Proteſtants, accuſing this Council thereof, yet do the ſame thing in their own. That this Council requires not, from all perſons, an explicit knowledge and belief of, or aſſent to, all theſe their *Definitions* under pain of loſing *Salvation*; where an ignorance of them is without *contempt* of the Churches Authority, and where the perſons, after knowing them, do not perſiſt obſtinatly to contradict, or refuſe to ſubmit their judgment, and give credit to them, as the Deciſions of a

§. 266. To Ψ.

Judge, authorized by our Lord to determine ſuch *Controverſies*, and ever preſerved infallible in all *Neceſſaries*. Laſtly, That, in the beginning of the Council, *two* wayes being propoſed, as *Soave* relates, † the one, *to condemn the* Lutheran *Hereſie in general, and their* Books; *only ſingling out ſome chief Article, thereof to be Anathematized*; the other.—*To bring under examination all the propoſitions of the Lutheran Doctrine capable of a bad conſtruction; and out of theſe to cenſure and condemn that, which, after mature Deliberation, ſhould ſeem neceſſary and convenient, with much reaſon the Council ſeems to have taken the latter of theſe, though much more tedious and painful*, For the greater benefit both of thoſe within, and thoſe without, the Churches Communion; that her *children* might more exactly know all thoſe *noxious* Tenents they were to avoid, and her *adverſaries* thoſe they were to reform. And if, in taking this ſecond way, the *Council* eſcaped not obloquy, yet much more had they incurred it in taking the *firſt*; *e.* in condemning ſo many Perſons and their writings for many Corruptions of Catholick Truths, and then naming none, or a few; and not uſing ſo much care in ſifting the Novelties of *Luther*, who drew ſuch a train after him, as their Predeceſſors at *Conſtance* did, in thoſe of *Jo. Wicleff.* or *Jo Huſs.*

p. 192.

§. 267. Neither, in ſo *particular* a Diſcuſſion and Cenſure of the *Lutheran* Doctrines, is this Council deſtitute of the *Example* of many former *Councils*, very copious in their *Anathemas* againſt Hereſies of a much leſs latitude, and in ſome matters, as conſidered in themſelves, ſeeming of no great Malignity. For which; ſee no leſs than *twelve* Anathemas of the third General Council paſſed againſt *Neſtorius*, according to the ſeveral Particulars, whereinto his *Error* had breached it ſelf, and colours, he had laid upon it, though all pointing at one thing; *two perſons in our Lord Chriſt* (a thing *Soave* ſaith, || the Council of *Trent* took notice of, and ſet before them as a Pattern:) See the 25 *Anathemas* of the Syrmian Council, all relating to ſeveral branches of *Photinianiſme*: The *eight* Anathematiſmes of the Milevitan Council purſuing all the particular points of *Pelagianiſme*. The *eleven* Anathemas of the ſecond Nicen Council, † all about *veneration* of *Images*: The twenty Anathematiſmes of that ancient Council at *Gangra*, A. D. 319. (wherein the famous *Oſius* was preſent) pronounced againſt the Euſtathians, letting nothing, how ſmall ſoever it might ſeem to be, in this their cenſure paſs unbranded. wherein this Sect was found to oppoſe the *Churches* common Doctrine, and Practice. Many of which *Anathemas* of *former* Councils, if you pleaſe to compare with thoſe of *Trent*, you ſhall find ſeveral of them, as to the

|| *p.* 192.

† *Act* 7.

the *Gravity* of the matter, much inferiour: Laſtly, ſee the late *Council* at *Conſtance* condemning not only 45 propoſitions, of *John Wicliff* recited there, † but 260 more, beſides; of the ſame temper: All which had been formerly with much care, by the *Univerſity* of *Oxford*, gleaned out of his writings: they bringing under their cenſure not only ſuch *Articles*, as were *Blaſphemi*, *Hæretici*, or *Sedioſi*, but alſo, as were *temerarii*, *ſcandaloſi*, or *piarum aurium offenſivi*, and letting none eſcape them, that might do hurt. In the ſame Council alſo afterward †were no leſs than 30 propoſitions of *John Huſs* condemned. Now, we may preſume, that *Luther*, and his Followers, to thoſe who put their ſickle into their books, to bring to tryal what ſeemed faults, could not but yield an harveſt much more fertile: Nor was the care here to be leſs, where the danger was much greater. And, for this ſtrict Inquiſition, and ſearch made by Councils, we owe great thanks to the providence of God. For thus, whilſt the wantonneſs and curioſity of mens underſtanding, from the *Faith* delivered in *General* ſtill deſcends to things more *particular*; and ſo, raiſeth new Diſputes in the Church, and ſpreads falſe opinions, the contrary Determinations of Councils (regulated by *neceſſary Conſequences*) render alſo the *Chriſtian Faith* from time to time more *particular*, and ſo, more exact, and leſs liable to be corrupted; when all that (in queſtion) comes to be *ſtated*, that is clearly evidenced, and the knowledge thereof, any way uſeful. So, ſince the ſettling, by Council, of thoſe *particular* points contained in the Athanaſian Creed, explicating that of the Apoſtles much more ſhort, and General, the Church, as to *theſe* points, hath enjoyed a great repoſe, and freedom from thoſe diſputes, with which ſome ages of it before were miſerably diſtracted. And, if the *Decrees* of the Council of *Trent* have had the ſame effect (as *Soave* complains they have, in the beginning of his Hiſtory †) the Proteſtants may impute it to their precedent queſtioning of the Churches Doctrine, and diſturbance of her peace.

† *Seſſ.* 8.

† *Seſſ.* 15.

† *p.* 1, 2.

§ 268. To *ω*.

To *ω*. See what is ſaid before, §. 244. *Bene facere, male audire*, is the common fortune of *Governours*, and to the cenſorious and male-contents the world is ſtill out of *order* (though God himſelf Governs it,) and the *worſt* times are alwaies the *preſent*. Whether the *Trent Decrees* for *Reformation*, which were never ſo numerous in any Council, and deſign'd from the beginning of it to have an half ſhare, with points of Doctrine, in all their Conſultations, and in the compoſition of which ſo many ſeveral Parties, well ſeen at leaſt in one anothers Defects, concurred, were ſo contrived as to remove *motes*, and not *beams*, to cure *itches*, not *fe-*

vours, I must refer you to the re-consideration of the particulars set down before, from, §. 212. Neither may we think, that it was the meddling with *moges*, that offended so much, either the Court of *Rome*, or of *France*, as *Soave* tells us their reformation did. For any *defects*, still seen in Church-Government, Discipline, &c, (which alwaies are, and will be, many) it ought not to be charged on these laws, but the non execution of them; which neglect also useth to be much more in those *laws*, that are more *exact*, and *perfect*, and so more contrary to common practice. But, since the sitting of this Council, there have not wanted those pious Bishops (as S. *Carlo Borremeo*, and others) who moulding their *Reformations* exactly according to these *Decrees*, have manifested to the world the great perfection thereof.

§. 269. To α α. † *Sess.* 25. *De Reform. Gen. c.* 18. To α α. See what hath been said in Defence of this *Dispensative Power* placed in the *Supreme Ecclesiastical* Governour, before, §. 216. 1. The Council, weighing the conveniences thereof with the inconveniences, yet declared, † — *Publice expedit, legis vinculum quandoque relaxare, ut plenius, evenientibus casibus, & necessitatibus, pro communi utilitate satisfiat.* Else, the laws may sometimes hurt, where they should help. 2. Again, this Dispensative Power, deposed in this Ecclesiastical Supreme, is no new usurpation, but an ancient priviledge injoyed alwaies by him: Of which see before, § 217. 3. Next: It had here some qualifications, and clogs laid upon it by the Council: As; † that such *Dispensation* shall be accounted *surreptitious* and void, when not given *gratis*, and *causâ prius cognitâ*; the *Ordinary* being constituted the *Inspector* and Examiner of this. † Now he must be very perversly wicked, who will issue forth such a *Dispensation*, where he neither receives *benefit* by it, nor sees *just cause* for it. 4. Lastly. The same Dispensative Power, as to the *civil* Laws, is reposed in the *Secular Supreme*; neither is the vigor of such Laws esteemed to be overthrown by it.

† *See before* §. 215. † *Sess.* 25. *c.* 18.

To β β. To β β. See before (§. 204.) the contrary declared by *Soave*.

This briefly, here, to the *Protestant Objections*, the satisfaction of which hath been more largely prosecuted through the whole Body of the former Discourse.

And thus, through many obstacles, I have at length finished my Design, the Vindication of a *Council*, which, once admitted, hath passed a peremptory sentence against the new pretended *Reformation*, and determined all the chiefest modern *Controversies*,

CHAP.

CHAP. XIIII.

Of the pretence of following Conſcience, againſt Church-Authority.

Two Defences againſt obeying, or yielding Aſſent to, Church-Authority, §. 271.

1. *The Neceſsity of following our Conſcience.*
2. *The Certainty of a Truth, that is oppoſed by the Church.*

Reply to the firſt,

That following our Conſcience, when miſinformed, excuſeth not from fault, §. 272.

Three waies, whereby the Will uſually corrupts the Judgment or Conſcience, and miſleads it, as it pleaſeth, in matters of Religion.

1. *Diverting the intellect to other imployments, and not permitting it at all to ſtudy and examine, matters of Religion,* §. 274,
2. *Permitting an inquiry or ſearch into matters of Religion: but this not impartial, and univerſal,* §. 275.
3. *Admitting a free, and univerſal, ſearch as to other points controverted in Religion, but not as to Church-Authority,* §. 277.

Where,

That the Judgment may, and often doth, oblige men to go againſt their own Opinion, and ſeeming Reaſon, §. 278.

AFter all this pains taken for eſtabliſhing the *Legal Authority* of this *Council*, ſome perhaps will wiſh this labour had been rather ſpent in a confirmation, by ſolid and evident arguments, of the *Truth* of its particular *Decrees*: becauſe, though we have our end, and though this Council ſhould be granted juſtly to claim all that obedience, which will be confeſſed due to the *moſt ſupreme* Church-Authority; Yet this moſt Supreme Church-Authority is denied by Proteſtants rightly to challenge *obedience* from its Subjects, eſpecially that of *aſſent*, in ſeveral caſes: Whereof two are much urged, and ſo ſeem neceſſary here to be a little more exactly conſidered, before I diſmiſs the Reader, that the precedent Diſcourſe may not be fruſtrated, by ſuch pretences, of its deſired effect. §. 270

The

vours, I must refer you to the re-consideration of the particulars set down before, from, §. 212. Neither may we think, that it was the meddling with moſes, that offended ſo much, either the Court of *Rome*, or of *France*, as *Soave* tells us their reformation did. For any *defects*, ſtill ſeen in Church-Government, Diſcipline, &c, (which alwaies are, and will be, many) it ought not to be charged on theſe laws, but the non execution of them; which neglect alſo uſeth to be much more in thoſe *laws*, that are more *exact*, and *perfect*, and ſo more contrary to common practice. But, ſince the ſitting of this Council, there have not wanted thoſe pious Biſhops (as S. *Carlo Borremeo*, and others) who molding their *Reformations* exactly according to theſe *Decrees*, have manifeſted to the world the great perfection thereof.

§. 269. To α α. See what hath been ſaid in Defence of this *Diſpenſative Power* placed in the *ſupreme Eccleſiaſtical* Governour, before, §. 216. 1. The Council, weighing the conveniences thereof with the inconveniences, yet declared, † — *Publice expedit, legis vinculum quandoque relaxare, ut plenius, evenientibus caſibus, & neceſsitatibus, pro communi utilitate ſatiſſiat.* Elſe, the laws may ſometimes hurt, where they ſhould help. 2. Again, this Diſpenſative Power, depoſed in this Eccleſiaſtical Supreme, is no new uſurpation, but an ancient priviledge injoyed alwaies by him: Of which ſee before, § 217. 3. Next: It had here ſome qualifications, and clogs laid upon it by the Council: As; † that ſuch *Diſpenſation* ſhall be accounted *ſurreptitious* and void, when not given *gratis*, and *cauſâ prius cognitâ*; the *Ordinary* being conſtituted the *Inſpector* and Examiner of this. † Now he muſt be very perverſly wicked, who will iſſue forth ſuch a *Diſpenſation*, where he neither receives *benefit* by it, nor ſees *juſt cauſe* for it. 4. Laſtly. The ſame Diſpenſative Power, as to the *civil* Laws, is repoſed in the *Secular Supreme*; neither is the vigor of ſuch Laws eſteemed to be overthrown by it.

To α α. — † *Seſſ.* 25. *De Reform. Gen. c.* 18. — † *See before* §. 215. — † *Seſſ.* 25. *c.* 18.

To β β. See before (§. 204,) the contrary declared by *Soave*.

This briefly, here, to the *Proteſtant Objections*, the ſatisfaction of which hath been more largely proſecuted through the whole Body of the former Diſcourſe.

And thus, through many obſtacles, I have at length finiſhed my Deſign, the Vindication of a *Council*, which, once admitted, hath paſſed a peremptory ſentence againſt the new pretended *Reformation*, and determined all the chiefeſt modern *Controverſies*,

CHAP.

CHAP. XIIII.

Of the pretence of following Conscience, against Church-Authority.

Two Defences against obeying, or yielding Assent to, Church-Authority, §. 271.

1. *The Necessity of following our Conscience.*
2. *The Certainty of a Truth, that is opposed by the Church.*

Reply to the first,

That following our Conscience, when misinformed, excuseth not from fault, §. 272.

Three waies, whereby the Will usually corrupts the Judgment or Conscience, and misleads it, as it pleaseth, in matters of Religion.

1. *Diverting the intellect to other imployments, and not permitting it at all to study and examine, matters of Religion,* §. 274,
2. *Permitting an inquiry or search into matters of Religion: but this not impartial, and universal,* §. 275.
3. *Admitting a free, and universal, search as to other points controverted in Religion, but not as to Church-Authority,* §. 277.

Where,

That the Judgment may, and often doth, oblige men to go against their own Opinion, and seeming Reason, §. 278.

§. 270

After all this pains taken for establishing the *Legal Authority* of this *Council*, some perhaps will wish this labour had been rather spent in a confirmation, by solid and evident arguments, of the *Truth* of its particular *Decrees*: because, though we have our end, and though this Council should be granted justly to claim all that obedience, which will be confessed due to the *most supreme* Church-Authority; Yet this most Supreme Church-Authority is denied by Protestants rightly to challenge *obedience* from its Subjects, especially that of *assent*, in several cases: Whereof two are much urged, and so seem necessary here to be a little more exactly considered, before I dismiss the Reader, that the precedent Discourse may not be frustrated, by such pretences, of its desired effect.

The

§. 271. The firſt *Guard*, That is uſed againſt obedience to ſuch *Authority*, is this. That none can be juſtly obliged to obey any humane Authority, ſo, as to go againſt his conſcience, or profeſs any thing truth, which he thinks error. For, though ſuch perſon erre in thinking ſuch thing an error, yet muſt ſuch an erroneous *conſcience*, and not ſuch Authority, in this caſe, be followed, and obeyed.

The ſecond is: That, at leaſt, none are obliged to obey the Definitions, or Judgment, of a legal Church-Authority, where ſuch are, not only *perſwaded* in *conſcience*, but *demonſtratively certain* (as ſome affirm they are) of the contrary to its Definition; and that, therein, it manifeſtly erreth.

§. 272. These two, then, ſhall be conſidered in their order. And to the firſt of them, I return this. 1. That, where Conſcience, or Judgment (for theſe are both one) propoſeth any thing for truth, yet not without ſome *doubt*, and *fear* of the contrary, here the Will, or the Perſon, ought to ſuſpend action, and put the Judgment firſt on a further ſearch. 2ly That, where ſuch *fear* is not, the Judgment (erring, or not erring) is indeed to be obeyed: becauſe the perſon alwaies ſuppoſeth this, not to erre, but to propoſe what is right, ſince he hath no way to know when it erres, but by it ſelf: And it alſo can never erre *knowingly*, or *willingly*. 3ly Yet: That in the action, wherein he followeth it when erring, he may much offend God; and this more or leſs, according to the quality of the error, namely, where the Judgment, or Conſcience, doth not invincibly, but culpably, erre; and hath means of being better informed, and ſo of diſcovering its error. So the Jews, when killing our Lord and his Apoſtles, moſt grievouſly offended God, in following an erroneous Judgment, or Conſcience dictating to them, that they *did God good ſervice* herein. And indeed it is a great art of the Devil, as much as he can, to put out the eye of the Judgment, to make men act more reſolutely, where Conſcience leads them on; he finding, that the zeal of ignorance doth him far more ſervice, than a timorous hypocriſie, and diſſembling againſt Conſcience, could ever do.

§. 273. Now here you ſee; our freedom from Guilt, in not ſubmitting to Authority, is devolved wholy on this, our care, that this our diſſenting Conſcience, or Judgment, be rightly informed; ſeeing our non-obedience finds not the leaſt patronage, or excuſe, from a Conſcience culpably erring. And, with this care of well-informing the Judgment or Conſcience, it is the *Will*, that is intruſted; though the underſtanding doth the work. For we muſt know; that, though the Underſtanding, in its *aſſents*, or *diſſents*,

diſſents, acts neceſſarily; and cannot but know, and believe, what it knows, and believes: and doth (generally, in all its acts) follow the evidence of its object (ſo far as it appears,) not the command of the will: And, therefore, Secondly, as to thoſe Principles that are *per ſe nota*, and ſelf-evident [as; *That every whole is bigger than a part: The ſame thing cannot be, and not be. Equals taken from Equals, the remains will be equal: Good is to be followed, Evil avoided,*] the Judgment cannot ſuffer the leaſt corruption, or alteration, from the Will: Whence it is, that as to ſuch Principles, all men, how differently ſoever ingaged in their affections, do fully conſent, and agree. Yet, as for other propoſitions, the truth of which is not diſcerned from any ſelf-evidence, but learnt by proofs and arguments drawn from ſome other things better known, here the truth of ſuch propoſition cannot be attained, but by the induſtry and application of the intellect to the ſtudy, and diſcovery of ſuch proofs; and again, ſuch application of the intellect to one thing, or another, for a little, or a long time, depends wholy on the Will. And thus come our opinions and tenents to be ſubjected to our Will, and ſhe again is ſo, commonly, to our ſecular intereſts. And ſhe, thus, by applying the Intellect, or Judgment, to what things, and how far, ſhe thinks fit, makes in it what impreſſions ſhe pleaſeth: And then, after all this, excuſeth her ſelf, that ſhe is led by it; that it is appointed her Maſter, and Director; that it alwaies neceſſarily aſſents to what appears truth to it, and that ſhe regularly practiſeth, and lives according to, its dictates. And ſhe corrupts it, in thoſe who deny obedience, in ſpiritual matters, to that Eccleſiaſtical Authority to which it is due, commonly by one of theſe three waies following. Which, charity towards thoſe, who are frequently thus deceived, obligeth me here firſt to ſet down more particularly; and then, to conſider ſome remedies thereof.

§. 274.

The *Will*, then, is wont to abuſe the *Judgment*, or *Conſcience*. 1. Either firſt, by keeping it in much *ignorance*, as to thoſe things wherein more knowledge may happen to be prejudicial to her, and check her contents; Applying it rather to Secular Affairs, or Humane Literature, and cautiouſly waving the conſideration of matters of *Religion*, and keeping it a ſtranger from all ſuch Debates; that ſo, when it is ſummoned, by its local Superiors, to a profeſſion thereof, it may ſoon reſolve it ſelf out of that ſtock, which in our former Education it hath received from our Parents, or other Inſtructors: and may alwaies, without ſcruples, move with the common ſtream, where we live, and whereon depend our fortunes: Or alſo, may readily become of any other perſwaſion, if a different intereſt calls for it: whilſt it is ſolidly founded in none, nor hath any deep counter-impreſſion to any ſide; but keeps the Judgment,

judgment, as to theſe matters of the greateſt concernment, in an indifferent, tepid, lazy, lukewarm ſloth, moſt pernicious to ſo many, as are not, by God's merciful providence, ranged under the Guidance of a juſt Church-Authority. And, ſuch perſons, ordinarily, quiet themſelves with that perſwaſion of ſome of the Donatiſts mentioned by S. *Auſtin*, † —*Nihil intereſſe credentes, in quâ parte quis Chriſtianus ſit; & ideo permanebunt in eâ parte, in quâ nati ſunt.* Or elſe think, at leaſt, by their voluntary winking, that they ſhall be excuſed, if they after this, ſtumble, or miſs their way.—*Tria ſunt* (ſaith this Father †) *hominum genera, profectò improbanda ac deteſtanda: Unum eorum, qui neque ſe ſcire exiſtimant, nec quærere volunt. Alterum eorum, qui ſentiunt quidem ſe neſcire, ſed non ita quærunt, ut invenire poſſint. Tertium eorum, qui ſe arbitrantur ſcire, quod neſcinnt.* Theſe then ſeem to be of the firſt ſort. *Qui neq; ſe ſcire exiſtimant, nec quærere volunt.* This is the firſt Deceit.

† *Epiſt.* 48.

† *De utilitate Credendi*, c. 11.

§. 275.

2. But, If the *Will*, (more piouſly inclined) thinks fit to apply it ſelf to the conſidering of matters of *Religion* (as which, ſurely, moſt concern all men, as to their Salvation, and Eternity;) 2ly It hath another way ſtill of corrupting the *Judgment*, * by permitting it only to be acquainted with ſuch Authors, or Directors, in theſe matters, as are of its party, and conſpire with its intereſts; and * by moſt carefully with-holding it from ſuch others, as write, or teach contrary; unleſs it be only ſo much of them, as its own Authors take in hand to confute. Which Authors, though they uſually relate both ſides of the Controverſie, and explain their adverſaries Tenents, as well as their own, (and ſo the Reader conceits himſelf impartial enough, in his receiving information of both parties) yet ſeldom do they, I mean, thoſe, who have not only an Adverſary, but the Truth, againſt them (for thoſe Writers, who have truth on their ſide, need no ſuch arts) ſeldom, I ſay, do they do this intirely, or advance and preſs their opponents reaſons, or arguments any further, than they think themſelves able to reſolve and diſſipate them: Often do they miſrelate, often alſo miſunderſtand, them: Often is the Queſtion, they not ſpeaking to the ſame thing, on both ſides ſtated true: and the anſwer very good, becauſe the objection is propoſed amiſs, and a reply ſhaped, to their own, not their Adverſaries, Arguments: and thus the *Judgment*, confin'd by the *Will* to ſuch a partial information from perſons, pleading both their Adverſaries cauſe, and their own, is, if not of an extraordinary apprehenſion, eaſily deluded; or if ſuch, much perplexed. The Fathers alſo, here not conſulted by this judgment in their own works, but only conſidered, as cited by theſe Authors

in

in some short Sentences disjoynted, and separated from the context (which, viewed in the whole piece, perhaps would appear quite of another colour) are made to speak whatever the Controvertist pleaseth; and, in all matters disputed, are usually brought in to bear witness on both sides. And by this device of conversing only with one sort, or sect, of Authors, the *Will* renders the *Judgment* of what opinion it pleaseth, by opening to the understanding in fair characters, and a full prospect of them, all those arguments and reasons, that favour one side; and removing quite out of sight, or much disfiguring, what is brought for the contrary. Or at least, if, by many shifts, matters on both sides can but be brought to an *Æquilibrium*; or, by much bandying to and fro, and multiplied replies, be made appear somewhat intricat, and *Quodlibetical*, here also with good reason, we think, we may take that scale, or side, which much complies with our secular advantages. These persons seem to be of the second sort of S. *Austins improbandi* (mentioned before) *qui sentiunt quidem se nescire, sed non ita quærunt, ut invenire possint.*

§. 276. And, by such a predominancy of the *Will* (either our own; or, if we in minority, theirs, who have the command and government over us) in these matters of *Science*, it is, that, though the persons be of very different intellects; and some, in all Places and Sects, of excellent parts; yet almost all those of one Nation; or Society; or such, in these, as are more bound together in one interest; from their having the same education under Parents, or other Instructors, that are all of the same perswasion; or, afterward, from their turning usually the same Books, are seen to be of the same Opinions, and to continue the same Sect of Religion; and those, contrarily instituted, and ingaged, elsewhere, to be all of another; though these two contrary opinions (whereof one many times is a truth, the other an error) are never almost supported with equal reason: nor would these opposit influences upon judgments equally piercing happen to be so universal, but from these *Arts* used by a *Will* preingaged. Now, as this is to be esteemed an happy captivity of the Judgment, and a very safe course for those, who are bred in the bosom of the Church-Catholick, and who are secure under an Ecclesiastical Guide; So is it to be looked on as a great misery in those Sects, divided from it. And it may be rationally presumed; that would private interest, every where, permit a free search, Truth, in all places, (I mean, such eminent truths, as the Catholick Church in her Councils hath recommended to the faith of Christians) would find more Disciples than Error; as having much more reason, and evidence, on its side.

§. 277.

3. A third way of blinding and miſleading the *Judgment* is When the *Will*, yet more candidly, allows and invites the Underſtanding, * to make a free and impartial ſearch into all ſides, and into whatever Authors, or other Teachers, ſeconding, or oppoſing, its preſent perſwaſions; and * equally to admit all ſuch arguments produced by theſe *pro* or *contra*, drawn from Scripture, or from Reaſon, that *intrinſecally* relate to the matter in Controverſie: But yet (perhaps fearing, that, here, all ſtands not right with him) allows it not to ſtudy firſt, and duely examine the main point of *Church-Authority* (which, if found ſo great, as it is pretended, would ſave many other ſearches;) Of Church-Authority I ſay: *viz.* what perpetual power our departing Lord hath left to the Governours thereof, and what aſſiſtance promiſed them, for expoſition of the ſence of the Divine Scriptures, where this diſputed; and for deciding controverſies in matters of faith: And what obligation he hath laid upon all the Churches Subjects to hearken to them, and not to depart from their Directions, and Determinations, *ne circumferantur omni vento doctrinæ in nequitiâ hominum* (a yoke the pride of the will hath no great mind to.) Yet a ſearch this to be undertaken much rather, than all the other; Becauſe, abſtracting from this Guide, after never ſo impartial a view of other intrinſecal arguments belonging to the ſubject debated, an ordinary underſtanding in points ſomuch *above reaſon*, may happily miſtake the Truth; and becauſe matters of Faith and Religion, wherein the Intellect now negotiates, depend chiefly on *Church-Tradition*, not rational-ſeeming proofs; And becauſe a Judgment, left to a free information of it ſelf herein, muſt needs find many perſwaſive arguments to entertain and prefer the Judgment of this Authority, when it is on one ſide, though this naked, and ſeconded with no reaſons at all (that are known to ſuch perſon) for its Propoſals, before all thoſe intrinſecal reaſons relating to the nature of the ſubject, that appear on the other. Such perſwaſive Reaſons, I mean, drawn from Authority, as theſe;

1 That this Authroity, that delivers the contrary to what all my
2 other arguments, or reaſons, recommend to me, is by our Lord inſtated in an *Infallibility* in all *neceſſaries*: and that it, not I,
3 alſo is to judge, what, or how much, is neceſſary: Or however, that this Authority (fallible or infallible) is, by the Divine Ordi-
4 nation, in ſuch points of Faith, and Religion, appointed my guide; and, in oppoſition of ſuch Authorities happening, the Superior
5 this Guide: (of which things enough hath been ſaid in the former Diſcourſes:) That, ſetting aſide theſe principal conſiderations, the
6 perſons conſtituting this Authority are alſo of greater parts,

longer

ger ſtudies, and (I have reaſon to preſume) more diſpaſſionate than my ſelf; and more in number, than I, or thoſe others of my perſwaſion: that they have ſeen and conſidered all thoſe reaſons, that as yet ſwey me, and have pronounced contrary: that they may have reaſons for their Deciſions that I have not ſeen, nor they are obliged to ſhew me, ſince my judgment ſtands ſubjected to theirs on another account, than the evidence of argument. §. 278.

Now in ſuch a caſe, or ſuppoſition, that the Intellect, left free to conſider, doth aſſent to ſuch extrinſecal arguments in behalf of Church-Authority, againſt any Reaſons belonging to the ſubject in debate, that perſwade me contrary to what it hath defin'd; Here, after ſtudying both *Authority*, and *Reaſon*, my final Judgment is, that I ought to joyn and ſide with the firſt, againſt the ſecond; though theſe reaſons be unſolv'd, or that none better, or none at all, be preſented to me, by the ſaid Authority. And ſo, now, to go againſt *my Reaſon* is to follow my *Judgment*, or *Conſcience*; and on the contrary; It is to go againſt my *Judgement* or *Conſcience*, if I follow theſe my *reaſons*, or my *private* judgment as grounded on them.

It may be ſome, who pretend that *Conſcience* releaſeth §. 279. them from *Authority*, have not well conſidered this; and therefore give me leave to dilate a little more upon it. If we look then into Secular Affairs, this matter ſeems decided in our ordinary practice. Do not we commonly, upon receiving the advice of an experienced Friend, a learned Phyſitian, or Lawyer, concerning our Eſtate, or our Health, both believe his Directions good: and, according to them, do, and alſo judge we ought to do, many things contrary to our own private Judgments: *i. e.* contrary to thoſe reaſons, which our ſelves have imagined, not to do ſo. Is not *Abraham* ſaid to believe a thing that ſeemed contrary to his own reaſon, *Rom.* 4. 17, 18? And ſo the man in the Goſpel, *Mark* 9. 24.. What is the meaning of that ſaying, ordinarily uſed alſo by Proteſtants, [Theſe and theſe *reaſons* I have for my *opinion*, but I ſubmit my *judgment* herein to the *Church*.] Is it (as Dr. *Fern* comments on it †) only; I ſubmit my judgment, as to the publiſhing of it? But this is only a ſubmiſſion of ſilence, not of our judgment at all, to the Church; and is a ſubmiſſion, which may well be performed in things, wherein our judgment is utterly fixed and unalterable; namely, in things, whereof we are infallibly certain. Again; What means that of Dr. *Hammond* (*Schiſm.* 2. *c.* §. 10, where he ſaith, —*A meek ſon of the Church of Chriſt, when the Fundamentals of Faith are not concern'd in the conceſſions*, &c. *will chearfully expreſs his readineſs to ſubmit, or depoſit, his own judgment*

† *Conſid. touching Reformation. c.* 1. *n* 16.

in reverence, and deference, to his Superiors; *Submit* and *Depoſit*; means it not, to renounce, and deſert it in ſuch matters; and to believe and hearken to the judgment of the Church, rather than to it? Neither can that of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 14. 23. *Whatever is not of faith is ſin*, be objected to any for ſo doing; Becauſe, who thus depoſits his judgment, doth it out of faith, namely, that the Churches Judgment is wiſer, ſafer, preferrable to, his own.

§. 280. Nor can this indeed rightly be conſtrued, a going againſt our own conſcience, or judgment, conſidered in general: Becauſe this preferring the Churches, before our own, judgment, is, certainly, an act alſo of our judgment: Since, when there is ſuch a weighty authority on the one ſide, and ſuch reaſons of our own, but theſe ſhort of certainty, on the other, our judgment here ſits upon, and examins, both; and at length gives ſentence, that, here, it is a ſafer courſe for us to ſubmit to the firſt, than rely on the ſecond. And here then, I only go againſt conſcience, if I adhere to the ſecond, and forſake the firſt. But indeed, if the Church (which it never doth) ſhould require me to ſubſcribe, not, that I give more credit to her Authority, than to my private Reaſons: but, that I have no private reaſons, or ſcruples, no repugnances of any veriſimilities to the contrary of her Definitions, when indeed I have ſo, nor as yet know how to clear them, ſuch ſubſcription or profeſſion, I grant, would be going againſt my conſcience, and muſt at no hand be done. This, That a ſubmiſſion of our Judgment, or profeſſing our aſſent to Authority, where we ſee no reaſons confirming its aſſertions, and many, for the contrary, is not, neceſſarily, a going againſt our own Conſcience, or Judgment.

CHAP.

CHAP XV.

Remedies of the former Deceits of the Will.

Conſiderations,

For remedying the firſt Deceit. §. 281. *Whether Salvation, &c.*

Where.

Whether Salvation may be had in any Chriſtian Profeſſion, retaining the Fundamentals of Faith, §. 282.

For remedying the ſecond Deceit, §. 289.

Where; *That perſons, not wholy reſigned to Church-Authority, ought to be very jealous of their preſent opinions: and indifferent, as Reaſons may move, to change their Religion,* Ib.

For remedying the third, §. 291.

Where,

1. *That the Illiterat, or other perſons unſatisfied, ought to ſubmit and adhere to preſent Church-Authority,* §. 292.

That learned Proteſtants have ſo determined this Point, §. 294.

That apparent miſchiefs follow the Contrary, §. 296.

2. *That, in preſent Church-Governours divided, and guiding a contrary way, ſuch perſons ought to adhere to the Superiors; and thoſe, who by their Authority conclude the whole,* §. 298.

3. *As for Church-Authority paſt, ſuch perſons to take the teſtimony, concerning it, of the Church-Authority preſent,* §. 301.

Yet, That it may be eaſily diſcerned by the Modern Writings, what preſent Churches moſt diſſent from the Primitive, §. 302.

Where; of the aſperſion of Antiquity with Antichriſtianiſme, §. 311.

NOw a Judgment once ſet free from the three former great Arts of the Will to miſguide it as any ones Secular Intereſt ſhall require, will begin to conſider, §. 281

I. In

1. In oppoſition to the firſt of them, mentioned before, §. 274 [keeping the judgment in ignorance as to Divine matters, and imploying it wholy about other ſtudies] That, ſince a right perſwaſion in Religion is of ſo great conſequence to ſalvation, All thoſe, who are not ſettled, in their Belief, upon the Baſis of Church Authority, and ſo, under it remain in a ſufficient ſecurity of their Faith, as to all thoſe points, wherein the ſenſe of the Holy Scriptures is diſputed, and controverted by ſeveral parties (as for example, in theſe: Whether Juſtification is by Faith alone? Whether there be Evangelical Counſels as well as Precepts? Whether Chriſt our Lord be Co-Eſſential with God the Father? Whether exhibiting his Corporal Preſence in the Euchariſt? Whether there be a Purgatory after this life for ſome imperfect ſouls, though departing in God's Grace? or the like;) All ſuch, I ſay, ſince they have taken the guidance of themſelves, in Spirituals, into their own hands, have great reaſon themſelves to fall, moſt attentively, to the ſtudy thereof. For it were to ſerve God too careleſly, and at hap-hazard, to caſt off Church-Authority for the Expoſition and Sence of God's Word in theſe diſputed, and difficult matters, and not himſelf to uſe any other indeavour at all for the right underſtanding of them. And in ſuch indeavour he ought not only to take a perfunctory view of ſome places, that may ſeem at the firſt ſight to repreſent to him what he would have, but to ſeek out all thoſe Texts, that both ſides build upon; and then diligently to examine and compare them, For, though ſome Texts may ſeem never ſo plain, as to the Literal, and Grammatical ſence [as what more clear, than,— *Accipite, comedite, Hoc eſt Corpus meum*;] yet ſcarce is there any ſentence, where the terms are not capable of ſeveral acceptions, Figurative, and Non-literal; Or, if they be not, all ſides muſt neceſſarily agree in their ſence, and ſo about ſuch Texts be no diſpute; And again, there being a neceſſary conſonancy, and agreement in every title of Scripture, no place, how plain ſoever, for the expreſſion, it ſeems to be, may be ſo interpreted, as to contradict another, that ſeems as clearly to ſay the contrary. He ought alſo to weigh not only the immediat ſence of Scripture, but the neceſſary conſequences; and, ſince whatever things are not oppoſit to Scripture, are truly lawful, and practicable, to diſcern the true, and not only pretended, repugnances thereto, He ought alſo to examin Tranſlations, peruſe the Comments, and Expoſitions of others, Modern, Ancient: For all theſe things that *Authority* moſt exquiſitly doth, whoſe judgment and conduct he declines. Laſtly, he muſt be a *Divine*, who will not be guided by *Divines*; for of the true way of Salvation

Matt 26.

tion none can securely be ignorant. And what Prelatical Protestant allows this in an Independent, or Fanatick, when he will neither guide his ignorance by following the learned, nor remove it by study?

§. 282. As for Salvation to be had in any Christian Profession; though it may be true in a Church, where all fundamentals are truly believ'd, and Baptism rightly administred, for so many as are invincibly ignorant of any better, or perhaps other communion; for Children, and Rusticks, those of an immature age, or of very low imployments, void of literature, and publick converse, and, by their mean condition and inexperience, destitute of any improvement of their knowledge; yet for all the rest, who have better means of understanding Divine matters, and of searching the grounds of their Faith, and state of their Communion; and on whose direction and example, every where depend the other meaner and younger sort of people, and by their default miscarry; || For these, I say, their case seems very dangerous, who happen to be in any separated Society out of the external Catholick Communion: Since the *One* God will be worshipped (as S. *Austin* † answered those Latitudinarian Donatists) not only *in verity*, but *unity*; and, again, hath left marks and Testimonies sufficiently evident for the discerning and distinguishing that Catholick Communion, wherein he will be worshipped, from all other Heretical, or Schismatical, Societies. All those therefore, who either, through their own fault, do not know this Communion, because they will not search; or, knowing it, yet voluntarily still remain in any other divided from it, must needs be in a very perillous Condition. The first, because their ignorance, in a thing so manifest, and withal so important, must needs be very gross, and unexcusable. The second, because any long stay in any such separated Society, to one convinced, seems both by the Scriptures, and by the Church, frequently prohibited; And, were it not so, at least brings so much detriment, and damage to the spiritual Condition of such a person, as is no way to be recompenced by any other fancied advantages injoyed therein. Which things it will not be amiss to discourse a little more fully, if perhaps some Laodicean complexion may receive some benefit thereby.

|| 1 *Cor.* 8. 11

† *Epist.* 48.

§. 283. 1st. Then; The remaining in any such Communion is prohibited by the Scriptures, in many places. *Eph.* 5. 7, 8. *The children of light are to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, nor to be partakers with them, but to reprove them,* — 2 Cor. 6. 14. *Light and darkness, Justice and iniquity, Believers and Infidels, the Temples of God* [which all good Christians are] *and of Idols,*

Idols, are to have no fellowship or communion, together: But, *Come Ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord.* And, 1 Cor. 3. 16. *Si quis Templum Domini violaverit disperdet illum Deus.* Nor may such separation be understood from Infidels, Heathens, or non-Christians only: For, 1 Cor. 5. 9. 11. *If a Brother* [*i. e.* one that professeth Christianity with us] *be a Fornicator, an Adulterer, an Idolater, a Drunkard, with such a one* we are charged *not to eat.* [But, to with-draw our ordinary converse from him: *i. e.* where no duty of charity, either to our selves, or to them, or to some others, obligeth us to the contrary. And this, for many good ends; as to preserve our selves from, all contagion, and infection, from their vices, or partaking of their punishments, or giving suspicion of our consentment with them in their errors; or scandal to others, who, by our example, may use the same converse to their hurt: To produce some shame and confusion, and so perhaps amendment, in them.] Upon this we read St. *Austins* Holy Mother *Monica* forbare sitting at table, or eating with her Son, when addicted to the Manichean Heresie. † Matt. 18. 17. *If any Brother* [*i. e.* in Christianity] *refuse to hear the Church, we to carry our selves to him as to an Heathen* [who were Idolaters] *or a Publican,* [with whom the religious Jews forbare to eat, or converse] —*Rom.* 16. 17. [*Those* [Christians] *that cause divisions contrary to the Doctrine, which we have received, to mark and avoid them.* —Titus 3. 10. *An Heretick, after admonition, to be rejected,* 2. Thess. 3. 14. *If any man obey not our word,* [be a Separatist from the Church, and her Doctrine] *note that man, and have no company with him.*—2 Joh. 10. *If there come any unto you, and bring not this Apostolical Doctrine, receive him not into your house; nor say* χαῖρε *God save you, to him: For he that saith so to him communicates with his wickedness.* And it seems this Apostles practice was according to his rule: For *Irenæus* ‖ saith, S. *Polycrap* related of him; That going into a Bath to wash himself, he presently leaped out of it, and departed, when he saw *Cerinthus* there, who denied our Lords Divinity.

† *Austin. Confess. l. 3. c. 11.*

‖ *l. 3. c. 3.*

§. 284. The same may be gathered from our glorified Lords own vehement expressions after his Ascension, (*Apocal.* 2 *d* and 3*d.* chapter) against those new Sects that indeavoured to mingle themselves with, and to seduce, the Catholicks, by tempting them to compliance, when in persecution; where he calls them,—*the Synagogue of Satan; Profunda Satanæ; Jesebels, followers of Balaam,* &c. Praiseth the Churches of *Ephesus,* and *Philadelphia,—for trying them, and not suffering them, and not complying, and denying him, with them; but hating their* [*deeds, as himself did,* See *Apoca-*

lyps,

lyps, 2. 2, 6.—3. 8. 9.) and censureth others of the Churches for doing the contrary (*Apoc.* 2. 14, 15, 16, 20.) and especially reprehendeth that of *Laodicea*, —*for her lukewarmness, and neither being cold, nor hot*; and then urgeth her to be zealous, *Apoc.* 3. 15, 16, 19. The same also seems to appear by his severe censure (upon occasion of the *Samaritan Woman's* consulting him about her Religion) of the Samaritan, Schismatical, worship (in a Temple built, in opposition to that in *Jerusalem*, some 250. years before our Lords coming, in Mount *Garisim*: Which one *Manasses* the High Priest, expelled from the function of his Office in *Jerusalem*, procured to be erected, and afterward officiated there) our Lord telling this woman, *That the Samaritans knew not what they worshipped*; *and that salvation was of the Jews*. And before this, the same appears * from Gods great displeasure against the Division made by *Israel* in setting up the Calves, though 'tis probably imagined, worshipping still the same God in the same Representation of Cherubims, only in another place. And afterward, * from *Elias* his expostulation with the people, 3 *King.* 18. 21.—*Usque quo claudicatis in duas partes?* which holds as well for separating Sects, as false Religions: God having so established the *Oeconomy* of his Church; as to be worshipped therein in *unity*, as well as *verity*: *Unus Dominus* [Caput] *unum* [Corpus, *& una fides*, Eph. 4. 4.

From all these Texts prohibiting Communication, in our daily converse, with particular persons so affected, I argue, how much more, we not to communicate, [1] with whole Congregations of them; and [2] with such Congregations separated from the Church, and [3] this, in holy things; lastly, [4] so communicating with *them*, in these, as to forbear the same Communion with the *Church Catholick*.

§. 285 Yet some of these, and several other Texts (See 1 *Cor.* 10. 20, 21.—1 *Cor.* 5. 4, 5, 13.—2 *Cor.* 6. 14, 17) seem more chiefly to prohibit Communion with such in the Sacraments (especially that of the Holy Eucharist) and the publick Divine Worships and this, upon some other, yet higher, reasons: Namely, the duty of the publick owning and professing our Religion, and the keeping it pure from, and unmixt with, any unbelieving, Heretical, or Schismatical, Societies. For this Holy Sacrament of feeding at the Lords Table, being instituted as for a sacred instrument of our Communion with the Deity, so also for a publick *tessera*, and mark, of a strict league, and amity between all those, who together partake it, so that, (as the Apostle saith, 1 *Cor.* 10. 17.) *by being made partakers of that one bread and Body* [of our Lord] *we, though*

being many, become one bread, and one Body; and so, in this Body members of one another; things, I say, standing thus in this Grand Sacrament of Union, neither will the honour we owe to God the Father, *who dwelleth in us, and adopts us for his children* (2 Cor. 6. 16, 18.) Nor, to God the Son, *of whose Body we are members*, (1 Cor. 6. 15, 16.) Nor to the holy Spirit, *whose Temples we are*, (1. Cor. 3. 16, 17.) suffer us, by such a sacred, and solemn tye to link and unite our selves to any Congregations, that are once estranged from him, or disclaimed by him. This is mingling *light* with *darkness*: † joyning the *members of Christ* to a Spiritual *Harlot*, by which they *two* become *one* Body (1 Cor. 6. 15, 16.) (For such a vertue hath this Sacrament, as that they become *one Body* amongst themselves, that partake it:‖) And, *by touching the uncleau, our selves also becoming unclean* (Lev. 5. 2, 3.) For all those separations under the law of the corporally unclean from the Congregation of the Lord, because they were to be *a sanctified people unto the Lord, and holy as he is holy* (Lev. 11. 43, 44.) were only types of the separation, which ought to be, from such notorious sinners, and such false worshippers of him, as we here speak of: To which the Apostle makes application of them, 2 Cor. 6. 17.—*Be ye separate; and touch not the unclean thing, saith the Lord*: taken out of *Esa.* 52. 11. And hence also taketh he strict order for the *separation* and *ejection* of such persons out of the Church (especially from the communicating the Sacraments thereof) as of a piece of Leaven from a lump unleavened, that our Christian Passeover may not be celebrated with such a sowr meslange (See 1 Cor. 5. 2, 5, 7, 13.) *Ejection*, I say, or casting them out, where the Church hath the power: Or, her going out from them, (2 Cor. 6. 17.) where they have the power; but still a separation there must be; else, in consorting with them, we provoke our Lord to jealousie, (1 Cor. 10. 22.) as if we are not a true and loyal Spouse to Him, and entirely his.

2 Cor. 6. 14.

‖ 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17.

To these may be added all those Texts requiring the glorifying of God in our publick worship of him in the Society of his true Church, and in the *Confession* of Christ before *men*: *Confession of him with the mouth, as well as believing on him with the heart* (Rom. 10. 9, 10.) *of all persons with one mouth, as well as with one mind* (Rom. 15. 6.) Which Texts seem in a special manner to imply that Confession, which is made in the *publick Assemblies* of the Church: Which *Assemblies* therefore were never intermitted in its greatest persecutions from the Civil Magistrates.

To these again may be added those many precepts of *Unity* and *Charity* injoyned amongst all the fellow-members of Christ,

(*Eph.*

(Eph. 4. 3, 11, 12.—1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *&c.*—*Phil.* 1. 27, 28.—*Jo.* 10. 4, 5.) which Texts seem to extend and oblige to all the external, as well as internal, acts thereof; especially, for what concerns Gods publick service and worship. And that Article of our Creed, that we believe *one Church Catholick and Apostolick*, *i e* One external, visible Communion upon earth, united in its members, that alwaies is, and shall be such, seems not sufficiently asserted, and professed by any, who forbears to joyn himself openly unto it. Such a *denial* before *men* of the *Body* of Christ, his *Church*, seems not to fall much short of the crime, of *denying* before *men* the *Head*, *Christ* Himself. But chiefly there, where this Church, the Spouse of Christ, happens to be under any disgrace, or Persecution, here our taking up the Cross with her, and the Doxology of *Confessing* him, and her, seems yet more zealously to be imbraced; and no such opportunity of so highly promoting our Eternal reward, upon any Secular inductive whatsoever, to be omitted: For which consider, *Heb.* 10. 25.

§. 286.

2. This of the *remaining* in any such *separated* Congregation prohibited in Scriptures; and the contrary also there required. Next, It is also both prohibited by the ancient *Canons* of the *Church*; and disallowed by her *practice*.

For the *Canons*; see those early ones: *Can. Apost.* 11, 12, 13.—12.—*Si quis cum damnato Clerico, veluti cum Clerico, simul oraverit, iste damnetur.*—11. *Si Quis cum Excommunicato saltem in domo locutus fuerit, iste communione privetur.* Which Canon calls to mind again, 2 *Jo.* 10. And || *Eusebius* reports of *Origen*, when yet a youth; that necessitated, by reason of poverty, to live in the same house with *Paulus*, one not Orthodox in the Faith, yet he forbare to be present at Prayers with him:—*Quippe qui, ab ineunte ætate, Ecclesiæ Canonem obtinuisse observasset*, probably those Apostolick ones, before named. See *Concil. Laodicen*: held by the Catholicks in the time of the reigning of Arrianisme before the Second General Council: Where, as it is decreed.—*Non oportere cum Paganis festa celebrare*, (c. 39.) And,—*Non oportere à Judæis azyma accipere* (c. 38.) So,—*Non oportere cum Hæreticis, vel Schismaticis, orare* (c. 33.) And *non oportere Hæreticorum benedictiones accipere* (can: 32.) See *Concil. Carthag.* 4. (held, *A. D.* 436. a little after S. *Austins* death) can. 72.—*Cum Hæreticis nec orandum, nec psallendum*: And, c. 73. *Qui communicaverit, vel oraverit cum excommunicato, sive Clericus sive Laicus excommunicetur.* So it is then, that all Hereticks and Schismaticks, such as make Congregations, and celebrate the publick Divin: Worship, separate from the Church, stand Excommunicated and

|| *l.* 6 *c.* 13.

Anathematized, by the ſupreme Church-Authority in ſeveral Canons of Councils. And hence all thoſe ſtand ſo too, who communicate with them in ſuch their ſervice: For: This freequenting, and joyning with them in, their ſervice, is an *external profeſſion* of ſuch *ſeparation*; which *external Profeſſion* alwaies it is, that the Church, not knowing Hearts, proceeds againſt in her Cenſures. And the Church, in her expelling ſuch *Congregations* from being members any longer of her Communion, may be imagined, much more, to prohibit any pretender to *her* Communion from being, or appearing, a member of *theirs*. And, though the *modern* Church-laws, in ſeveral caſes, may perhaps have remitted ſome of the *ancient* rigor, that reſtrains our preſence, with known, and declared, Hereticks, in the *Catholick* Divine Service, or Sacraments, and hath admitted ſome limitations; Yet the communicating with any of a ſeparated external communion in their Divine Service, or in ſuch Holy things, or Divine Worſhip, as are commonly underſtood, and taken, for a diſtinctive note of ſuch ſeparation from that Church, which is the *Catholick*, ſuch a diſſembling of ones Religion is at no hand lawful: but is a denying, before men, of Chriſts Church, and ſo of Chriſt: ſince who thus denies conjunction with the *Body*, denies it with the *Head* alſo, that is joyn'd to this Body. Nor was there, in any times, the leaſt diſſimulation in any thing required as an external Teſſera, and Touch-ſtone of their Religion, I ſay not, a non-profeſſing of our Religion, but a profeſſing againſt it, ever ſuffered, or excuſed, in the greateſt Perſecutions: Though other uſual ceremonies and practices of the Church, not diſtinguiſhing, ſo eſſentially and properly, her Communion (nor this communion made a neceſſary conſequent of them) but inſtituted, and performed for other ends, may, amongſt *Separatiſts*, be diſpenſed with, and omitted; As faſting, or abſtinence, on daies appointed for them: Provided, no great ſcandal happen thereby. But, whatever compliances with Separatiſts for our Secular conveniences may be lawful, yet, ſince all ſuffering for the Catholick Religion is a degree of Martyrdome, it is much nobler, by keeping the ſtricteſt diſtance, to aſpire to what is moſt perfect, than, by ſeeking inlargements, to hazard the doing of ſome thing unlawful.

§. 287. Next: For the Churche's ancient *Practice* (viz. the Catholicks neither going to the *Prayers*, or *Sacraments* of *Sectariſts*, nor admitting theſe to their own) Their Letters Commendatory, mentioned, *C. n. Apoſt.* 13. called *Epiſtolæ formatæ*, ſufficiently ſhew, how cautious and ſtrict it was: Which Letters, from the Churches careful avoiding all mixture with Sectaries, were procured, ſo often

as

as any had occaſion to travel from one Church to another; Without which Teſtimony they could not be admitted to their prayers, *&c.* The ſame alſo appears from the ſtrict ſeparation of Catholicks from the potent diviſion of the Arrian Sect. Which Arrians, though, in many of their Councils, they required ſubſcription of no *poſitive Hereſie*, but only an omiſſion, in their Creeds, of ſome Truth, the word μοσιον; yet were the Catholicks, even when much perſecuted by the Secular Princes, and, by the baniſhment of their Paſtors, in ſome places deſtitute of the Sacraments, ſtrictly prohibited to come at the Arrian Aſſemblies; though theſe had the ſame Sacraments with them, and poſſeſſion of the Cathedrals, and other Churches: and choſe rather, to relinquiſh their Temples, to pray at home, to live without the Sacraments: nay, to be without theſe in their ſickneſs, and at their death, than to receive them from the Arrians. See for theſe things, S. *Athanaſ. Epiſt. Synodica ad Antiochenſes*, —And *Epiſt. ad ubiq, Orthodoxos* —S. *Auſtin De verâ Religione, c.* 5.—S. *Hilary, lib. contra Arrian.* S. *Baſil. Epiſt.* 293. to ſome Egyptian Biſhops. And ſee, in *Theodoret*, || the jealous deportment of the Romans towards *Felix*: who ſubſtituted by the Arrian Emperor in *Liberius* his place, ſent into baniſhment, —*Tametſi* (ſaith *Theodoret*) *fidem in Concilio Nicæno expoſitam ipſe ſervavit integram, tamen, quia cum illis, qui eandem labefactare ſtudebant, libere communicavit, nemo ex Romæ habitatoribus in Eccleſiam, dum ille intus erat, ingredi voluit.* And this reſolution, ſignified to *Conſtantius*, happily procured the return of *Liberius*. This of the Declaration of the Church, againſt any ſuch *liberty* of Chriſtian *Communion*, where ſoever our Secular intereſt, or Education, may be apt to fix us.

|| *Hiſt. l.* 2. *c.* 17.

3. But were there no ſuch bars put in againſt it, by the Scriptures, or H. Church; yet this were enough to diſſwade it; §. 288 that, by remaining in any ſuch ſeparated Society, either we are put to practice ſeveral things contrary to a right Faith, and good manners, and offenſive to a a good Conſcience: or at leaſt neceſſitated to forego the practice of many other things beneficial, (not to ſay, neceſſary) which are to be injoyed only in the Communion of this Catholick Church, not ſo in others. For a particular Catalogue of which (not to be here too tedious) I refer you to the Preface before the former Diſcourſes touching the Guide in Controverſies, and to the concluſion of the third Diſcourſe, §. 155 &c. Laſtly, as for that internal Communion with the Church, which, it granted, ſome, who want the external, may nevertheleſs injoy; or, the ſecurity of a *votum*, where is an actual defect, of the participation of its Sacraments, that ſome may have; they ſeem no way applicable

to ſuch perſons as thoſe, who are not by force hindred of her Communion; but, invited to it, do voluntarily deprive themſelves: And, partaking the Sacraments *in voto* ſignifies nothing to us, where, *de facto*, we may have them, and, *de facto*, do refuſe them. And, then, what other advantages can there be, that can make us ſatisfaction for ſuch a loſs?

I will conclude this point, with the Declaration ſent to the followers of the Donatiſts (ſome of whom, for their ſtay in that Sect, urged this very excuſe, we are now ſpeaking to,—*Nihil intereſſe, in quâ parte quis Chriſtianus ſit*) by S *Auſtin*, and the reſt of the Provincial Council at *Cirta* in *Numidia*, preſently after that famous Conference with them at *Carthage*, A. D. 411.†—*Quiſquis ab hac Catholicâ Eccleſia fuerit ſeparatus* [amongſt whom they reckoned the Sect of the Donatiſts] *quantumlibet laudabiliter ſe vivere exiſtimet, hoc ſolo ſcelere, quod à* Chriſti unitate *diſſunctus eſt, non habebit vitam, ſed ira Dei manet ſuper eum.* And, as for the Sacraments received in that ſeparation,—*Sacramenta Chriſti* [ſay they, though celebrated in the ſame manner with them, as in the Church] *in ſacrilegio ſchiſmatis, ad judicium habetis; quæ utilia, & ſalutaria, vobis erunt, cum in Catholicâ pace habueritis Caput, Chriſtum, ubi charitas cooperit multitudinem peccatorum.* Thus much (I fear not needleſly) I have taken occaſion (from §. 283.) to ſet down in oppoſition to that irrational Fancy, *Nihil intereſſe, in quâ parte quis Chriſtianus ſit*, not knowing, but that this Diſcourſe may meet with ſome Readers not much averſe from ſuch a perſwaſion. For, by the foreſaid Arts of the Will, mens Judgments are too apt to digeſt opinions very groſs, where the Secular advantages, by theſe, are very great.

† *S. Auguſt. Epiſt.* 152

§. 289. 2. Thus much conſidered by a Judgment, ſet at liberty, in order to the firſt Art of the Will to deceive it, *Viz.* Its keeping the Judgment in much ignorance as to the Divine matters, and to a cold indifferency as to parties; and diverting it wholy to other matters. Next, as to the Second, mentioned before, §. 275. (namely; applying it indeed to the learning of theſe Truths; but this, only from thoſe Authors, and Inſtructors, that are of its own party) a rectified Judgment will as freely conclude, and reſolve; That all thoſe, who are not well ſettled upon this Baſis of *Church-Authority*; and ſo, by a reſign'd obedience, have prevented all diſputes, ought rather, in making ſuch a queſt after Divine Truth, in ſo many Controverſies agitated between parties, and in chuſing their Religion, to apply themſelves, for learning it, to the reading of thoſe Books, and Authors, and diſcourſing with thoſe

thoſe perſons, who oppoſe the tenents, in which they have been educated; and to which all Secular, or carnal advantages do incline them: that thus they may bring things to ſome equipoiſe; and, having firſt heard the plea of both ſides, be able to make a truer Judgment. And if, in the iſſue, neither ſide do ſeem to preponderate, ſhould chuſe rather that, to which their intereſt ſeems more averſe; for they may well imagine, that men are ordinarily ſo far partial to their own ſide, that they would not think both equal, unleſs that againſt them were over weight: and that a crooked ſtaff, to be made ſtreight, muſt be bent the contrary way.

And, upon this, ſuch Judgment, alſo will conſider; That, ſince our firſt perſwaſions, in Religion, and the particular ſect thereof wherein we live, are not taken up upon our own choice, but anothers; who, having ſome command over us, anticipate our Judgment, and educate us in what opinions they pleaſe; hence it is, that our conſtancy and perſeverance, even ſometimes to the loſs of Eſtate, and Life, to whatever we thus caſually firſt light on (called by the name of *Fidelity* and love of *Truth*; and the contrary, *perfidiouſneſs*, and *Apoſtacy*) is indeed, before we have examined things better, only a raſh, and inconſiderat *Obſtinacy*; and that on the contrary, in prudence, every one ought to put himſelf in a great irdifferency to change thoſe firſt principles he is thus ſeaſoned and poſſeſſed with, as he ſhall, by new experience, find cauſe; and to eſteem that only *Conſtancy* in his *Religion*, *i. e.* in his true ſerving of God, to alter every day, and that through a thouſand Secular obſtacles, to any thing, wherein he conceives, he may ſerve him better. As in our manners, when any way deficient, we do this, without reproach.

Yet further will conſider, ſince (as hath been ſhewed) there is but one Communion of all thoſe various Sects, in which, promiſcuouſly, the Education of Chriſtian Youth happens to be moulded, namely that which adheres to the *Supreme Church-Authority*, that is *Catholick*, and truly diſingaged of *Schiſm*; That all thoſe, who find themſelves to live under ſuch *Superiors*, as are broken off, and ſtand divided, from *their* Superiors, and condemned by them, ought to entertain a great jealouſie of their preſent ſtate, and not acquieſce in any ſuch Government, at adventure; but preſently to reduce their ſubjection to that Authority that is eſtabliſhed by our Lord. Again, in the next place, that ſuch a one ought to improve, or to check, in himſelf, theſe ſuggeſtions of a *change*, as the Religion he deliberates on, is more licentious, or more ſtrict in compariſon of that, which for the preſent he profeſſeth.

professeth. For strong inclinations to change to a Religion that is more rigorous, and mortifying his lusts, that requires much Obedience, Resignation, and Humility from him, that captivates his understanding as well as curbs his appetites, things nature much reluctes against; we may presume to proceed from the Spirit of God: But, if to a Religion, that promiseth him in many things more liberty; to proceed from his lusts.

And, such a happy discovery being made by him, such a freed Judgment will proceed to consider; That, if yet further, by reason of the persecution of such a Religion, in the place where he lives, such a Convert hath an occasion also offered him of leaving Father, or Mother, Friends, or Fortunes, and, among the rest, not the least, his Reputation, and good Name, in being esteemed a *Turncoat*, an *Apostate*, a Seducer; to imbrace, again, in the Religion he turns to, nothing but Crosses, and Fastings, Confessions and Penances, Resignation of Judgment, strict obedience to the Churches, as well as Gods, Laws, and many more hardships, set before him, if he purposeth to arrive at perfection; such a true inlightened Judgment, I say, will here consider: that this is one of the greatest Honours, that his Divine Majesty could do him upon earth; and a happiness next to Martyrdom. Lastly, will consider, that the wisdom of God hath permitted so many *Sects* and Factions, divided from the true Church, and propagating their Schisms to their children, to exercise the diligence of such, as have the hap to be so mis-educated, to find out that holy Communion, of which he hath left sufficient testimony, and, after this, to practice their Christian Courage and Resolution, to own and repair to it.

§. 290. I find a lively description, of such fetters in an Hereditary Religion, and of a happy deliverance out of them, by repairing into the bosom of the Church, made by S. *Austin* in an instance of the Donatists (frighted with the Emperours severe Edicts) which I think may be usefully here transcribed for a pattern to such others, as are detained at present in the like chaines, in any other divided Sect.— *Quam multi* (saith he, speaking of the Donatists) *quod certo scimus, jam volebant esse Catholici, manifestissimâ veritate commoti; &, offensionem suorum reverendo, quotidie differebant; Quam multos non verita, sed obdurata consuetudinis grave vinculum, colligabat?— Quam multi propterea putabant veram Ecclesiam esse partem Donati, quia eos ad cognoscendam talem veritatem securitas* [or much more, *res prospera* in the continuing in their present Sect] *torpidos, fastidiosos, pigrosq; faciebat? Quam multis aditum intrandi observabant rumores maledicorum; qui nescio quid aliud nos*

in

in altari ponere jactitabant [what *maledicency* doth the Church ſtill ſuffer touching what ſhe affirms to be on her *Altars?*] *Quam multi nihil intereſſe credentes, in quâ parte quis Chriſtianus ſit, ideo permanebant in parte Donati, quia ibi nati erant? His omnibus harum legum terror ita profuit, ut nunc alii dicant: Jam hoc volebamus; ſed Deo Gratias, qui nobis occaſionem præbuit, faciendi, jam, & dilationum morulas amputavit. Alii dicant: Hoc eſſe verum, jam ſciebamus; ſed neſcio quâ conſuetudine tenebamur; Gratias Deo, qui vincula noſtra dirupit, & nos ad pacis vinculum tranſtulit. Alii dicant; Neſciebamus hic* [*i. e.* in the Church] *eſſe veritatem; nec eam diſcere volebamus: Gratias Deo, qui negligentiam noſtram ſtimulo terroris excuſſit, ut ſaltem ſolliciti quæreremus, quod, ſecuri, nunquam noſſe curavimus. Alii dicant; nos falſis rumoribus terrebamur intrare; quas falſas eſſe neſci remus, niſi intraremus; nec intraremus, niſi cogeremur; Gratias Deo, qui expertos docuit, quam vana & inania de Eccleſiâ ſuâ mendax fama jactaverit. Alij dicant; putabamus quidem nihil intereſſe, ubi fidem Chriſti teneremus; ſed Gratias Deo, qui nos à diviſione collegit; & hoc uni Deo congruere oſtendit, ut in unitate colatur.* Thus S. *Auſtin.* I need not comment upon it. A return into the Church, upon whatever occaſion, is welcom, and to be wiſhed for: and happy they, who, to preſerve an eſtate here on earth, are reduced into the true way to gain a better in heaven: or, to eſcape ſome puniſhment here, become freed alſo from that hereafter: But yet, much more acceptable, and praiſe-worthy, is ſuch a Converſion, wherein *fear* and *force* have no hand; and where perhaps this their ſecuring their *eternal* ſtate, and happy condition, muſt be built upon the ruine of their *temporal.*

3. This, for remedying the ſecond *Deceit.* For the third (delivered before, §. 277.) *Vix.* The weighing indeed univerſally, and impartially, all the *intrinſecal* reaſons, and arguments, *pro* and *contra*, that relate to the *ſubject* in hand; but not thoſe *extrinſecal* ones alſo, that confirm obedience, and ſubmiſſion of judgment, in all points whatſoever, already determined, to *Church-Authority*: Here alſo a judgment, ſet at liberty, will conſider: 1. That, in points of Controverſie, ſome of them certainly of great conſequence; where both the true ſence of the *Scriptures*, and of the *ancient Church*, is debated, with many adherents to either ſide; here all thoſe, who by reaſon of illiterat education, and mechanick imployments, are not able to compare, and weigh Texts of *Scripture*, and ſearch former *Church-Records*; or alſo thoſe, who, after ſuch ſearch (eſpecially if being of no extraordinary §. 291. 1.

capacity) find on all ſides things either, by ſubtile wits, rendred ſo ſmooth and probable, or, by multiplied replies, ſo intricated and involv'd, as they know not which to hold to; or alſo become ſtill of his opinion, whom they read laſt; That all theſe, I ſay, can take no other *prudent courſe* (were it no *duty enjoyned*) than to repair, and ſubmit their judgment, to *Church-Authority*, *i. e.* to their ſpiritual *Paſtors*, and *Superiors*, ſet over them by our Lord, and ſtating theſe things.

§. 292. Which Authority alſo, if it be ſuppoſed, either as to the underſtanding of Scriptures, or examining of ancient Tradition, liable to error; yet this ſtill ſeems *more* to perſwade their adherence to it, as implying more obſcurity and difficulty in the thing defin'd. And much reaſon have they to preſume, that theſe their ſpiritual Governours, both by reaſon of their convening in a greater body, and their conſiſting of more dignified perſons (probably advanced to ſuch high places by their greater merits) and by their great learning, being acquainted with, and weighing, all the ſame arguments that private men do, and, in charity we ought to think, they as diſpaſſionat as our ſelves, and laſtly, by their ampler fortunes, leſs neceſſitated to ſerve private intereſts, are, by all theſe, the *leſs* liable to error of the two: And that the confining of the belief of ſuch perſons to the directions of ſuppoſed fallible *Superiors* is, of the two evils, the much more tolerable, than the leaving them, in ſuch high and ſpiritual matters, to the roving of their *own fancies*: For thus, in ſtead of ſome few errors of the Church, in matters *obſcure*, will be multiplied thouſands, of ſuch perſons, in matters moſt *evident* and *clear*.

§. 293. S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks much on this ſubject in his Book *de utilitate Credendi*, of the benefit of believing the Church, written to his friend *Honoratus* (led away by many extravagant *Manichean* dotages) adviſing him ſubmiſſion of judgment to Church-Authority: —*Nihil eſt facilius* (ſaith he †) *quam non ſolum ſo dicere, ſed etiam opinari, verum inveniſſe, ſed reipſâ difficillimum eſt.* And †— *Quis mediocriter intelligens non plane videris ſtultis* [under which name, he ſaith, he comprehends all, except thoſe, *quibus ineſt, quanta in eſſe homini poteſt, ipſius hominis Deique firmiſſime percepta cognitio*] *utilius, atq; ſalubrius eſſe, præceptis obtemperare ſapientum, quam ſuo judicio vitam degere?* — *Hoc ſi in rebus minoribus; ut in mercando vel colendo agro, &c. expedire nemo ambigit, multo magis in religione. Num & res humana promptiores ad dignoſcendum ſunt, quam divina; & in quibuſque præſtantioribus & ſanctioribus, quo majus eis obſequium cultumq; debemus, eo ſceleratius, periculoſiuſq; peccatur.* And c. 17. he argues. —*Si unaqua; diſciplina, quanquam vilis & facilis, ut percipi*

† *De utilitate Credendi c. 1.*

† *c. 12.*

cipi poſſit, Doctorem aut magiſtrum requirit. quid temeraria ſuperbia plenius, quam divinorum ſacramentorum libros ab interpretibus ſuis nolle cognoſcere? And, c. 7.—*Nullâ imbutus poeticâ diſciplinâ Terentionum Magiſtrum ſine Magiſtro attingere non auderes,—Tu in eos libros, qui, quoquomodo ſe habeant, ſanctitamen divinarumq; rerum pleni, prope totius generis humani confeſſione, diffamantur, ſine duce irruis, & de his ſine præceptore audes ferre ſententiam, &c.* And, c. 16..—*Cum res tanta ſit, ut Deus tibi ratione cognoſcendus ſit, omnes ne putas idoneos eſſe percipiendis rationibus, quibus ad divinam intelligentiam mens ducitur humana?* Thus he, to induce *Honoratus*, in ſuch divine matters, to yield the guidance of himſelf to *Church-Authority*. And then, the *Church-Authority* he would have him ſubmit to, he deſcribes thus, *c.* 17.—*Quæ* [Eccleſia] *uſque ad confeſſionem generis humani, ab Apoſtolicâ ſede per ſucceſſiones Epiſcoporum, fruſtra Hæreticis circum latrantibus, & partim plebis ipſius judicio, partim Conciliorum gravitate, partim etiam miraculorum Majeſtate damnatis, culmen authoritatis obtinuit*: Cui *nolle primas dare, vel ſummæ profecto impietatis eſt, vel præcipitis arrogantiæ. Nam ſi nulla certa ad ſapientiam, ſalutemq;, animis via eſt, niſi cum eos rationi præcolit* [prepares them] *fides, quid eſt aliud ingratum eſſe opi, atq; auxilio divino, quam tanto labore, præditæ* [*præditæ* rather] *authoritati velle reſiſtere?* Again, c. 16.—*Quæ authoritas ſepoſitâ ratione (quam ſinceram intelligere, ut ſæpe diximus, difficillimum ſtultis eſt, dupliciter nos movet, partim miraculis* [very frequent in his times. See De Civit. Dei. l. 22. c. 8.] *partim ſequentium multitudine.* And c. 14.—*Quæ celebritate, conſenſu, vetuſtate, roboratur.* And c. 11.—*Si jam ſatis tibi jactatus videris, ſinemq; hujuſmodi laboribus vis imponere, ſequere viam Catholicæ diſciplinæ, quæ ab ipſo Chriſto per Apoſtolos ad nos uſque manavit, & abhinc ad poſteros manatura eſt.* I have given you St. *Auſtins* advice ſomewhat more largely, as hoping his words will have more weight.

§. 294. And becauſe, if this obligation of ſubmiſſion of judgment to Authority for the unlearned *not able* to examin Controverſies, or the learned, after examination, in ſome degree *unſatisfied*, be received for a truth, thus the *greateſt part* of Chriſtians, are, hereby, for ever ſettled in their *religion*, and *belief*, as to all points determined by the Church, I will here alſo ſet down, for the benefit of ſuch Readers, as moſt value their judgment, the teſtimony of ſeveral learned Proteſtants in confirmation of it; ſeveral of which have been mentioned in the former Diſcourſes. The Reader, who thinks the allegation of witneſſes needleſs in a matter ſo evident, and would only know, when *Eccleſiaſtical Authorities* divide and diſſent, to which of them his ſubmiſſion is due, may, omitting them, paſs on to, §. 296.

§. 295. n. 1. In confirmation hereof, then, firſt conſider that noted paſſage of Dr. *Field* in the Preface of his Book, recommending to Chriſtians chiefly the diſcovery of the *True Church*, and, when this found, ſubmiſſion to it.—*Seeing* (ſaith he) *the Controverſies of Religion in our times are grown in number ſo many, and in matter ſo intricate, that few have time, and leiſure, fewer ſtrength of underſtanding to examine them, what remaineth for men deſirous of ſatisfaction in things of ſuch conſequence, but diligently to ſearch out, which, amongſt all the* Societies *of the world, is that* bleſſed company of Holy ones, *that Houſhold of Faith, that Spouſe of Chriſt, and Church of the living God, which is the Pillar, and Ground of Truth, that ſo he may embrace her Communion, follow her Directions, and reſt in her* Judgment.

§. 295. n. 2. In the ſame manner Dr. *Hammond* writes, in his *Anſwer* to the *Catholick Gentleman*, chap. 2. p. 17.—*When the perſon is not competent to ſearch grounds* [I add, or not ſo competent as thoſe, to whoſe definition he is required to ſubmit] *a bare yielding to the judgment of Superiors, and a deeming it better to adhere to them than to attribute any thing to his own judgment, a believing ſo far as not to diſbelieve, may rationally be yielded to a Church, or the Governours of it, without deeming them inerrable.*—And in his *Treatiſe* of *Hereſie*, §. 13. n. 2, 3. he ſpeaks thus of the Chriſtians ſecurity, from the Divine Providence, in his adherence in matters of Faith to Church-Authority.—*If we conſider Gods great, and wiſe, and conſtant Providence, and care over his* Church, *his deſire that all men ſhould be ſaved, and in order to that end, come to the knowledge of all neceſſary truth; his promiſe, that he will not ſuffer his faithful ſervants to be tempted above what they are able; nor permit ſcandals, and falſe teachers to prevail to the ſeducing of the very Elect, his moſt pious godly ſervants; If, I ſay, we conſider theſe, and ſome other ſuch like general promiſes of Scripture, wherein this Queſtion* [about the errability of Councils] *ſeems to be concerned, we ſhall have reaſon to believe, that God will never ſuffer all Chriſtians to fall into ſuch a temptation, as it muſt be, in caſe the whole Repreſentative, ſhould* erre in matter of Faith [I adde, to define, therein, any thing contrary to the Apoſtles *depoſitum*, and which Chriſtians may not ſafely believe, or, without Idolatry, practice·] *and therein find approbation, and reception amongſt all thoſe Biſhops, and Doctors of the Church diffuſed, which were out of the Council. And, though, in this caſe, the Church might remain a Church (and ſo the deſtructive gates of hell not prevail againſt it) and ſtill retain all parts of the Apoſtles* Depoſitum *in the hearts of ſome faithful Chriſtians, which had no power in the Council to oppoſe the Decree; or, out of it, to reſiſt the general,*

neral approbation; yet ſtill the teſtimony of ſuch a General Council, ſo received, and approved, would be a very ſtrong argument, and ſo a very dangerous temptation to every meek and pious Chriſtian; and it is piouſly to be believed, though not infallibly certain,—That God will not permit his ſervants to fall into that temptation. Thus he. [But, if here the Doctor be asked, why, upon theſe conſiderations, he doth not ſubmit to all thoſe *latter Councils* held in the Church, that have delivered ſomething oppoſite to the *Proteſtant Tenents*: For example, all thoſe Councils concerning *Tranſubſtantiation*, held before *Luther*, I ſuppoſe his anſwer is ready, becauſe theſe were not *General*, nor *univerſally accepted*; But, ſince theſe were the *moſt General*, that the Churches Subjects have had in thoſe times for their direction; and had alſo the *moſt univerſal* acceptation, that thoſe times could afford, unleſs he would have alſo the *Berengarians*, the perſons condemned in them, to *accept* them (an acceptation moſt unreaſonably demanded,) why do not here alſo *Gods Providence*, and *Promiſes*, ſtand ingaged in compaſſion to the *meek*, and *pious*, Subjects of the Church, that theſe Councils erre not, nor the Chriſtians of thoſe times fall into ſuch a *temptation*, as it muſt needs be, if theſe, the *greateſt Repreſentatives* the Church had in thoſe dayes, ſhould miſinſtruct them in a matter of ſo great conſequence, as is the committing of Idolatry ever ſince?]

See alſo his *Comment* on 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. [*The Church the Pillar and Ground of Truth.*] *According to this it is* (ſaith he) *that Chriſt is ſaid*, Eph. 4. 12. *to have given not only Apoſtles*, &c. *but alſo Paſtors and Teachers*, i. e. *the Biſhops in the Church, for the compacting the Saints into a Church; for the building up of the body of Chriſt, confirming and continuing them in all truth, that we ſhould be no more like Children carried about with every wind of doctrine. And ſo again, when Hereſies came into the Church in the firſt ages, 'tis every where apparent by* Ignatius *his Epiſtles, that the only way of avoiding error and danger, was to adhere to the Biſhop in communion and doctrine; and whoſoever departed from him, and that form of wholſome words kept by him, was ſuppoſed to be corrupted*, &c. And in his *Treatiſe* of *Schiſme*, chap. 2. §. 10. he ſpeaks in this manner,—*A meek Son of the Church of Chriſt will certainly be content to ſacrifice a great deal for the making of this purchaſe*, i. e. *of enjoying the Churches communion; and when the fundamentals of the faith, and ſuperſtructures of Chriſtian practice are not concerned in the conceſſions, he will chearfully expreſs his readineſs to ſubmit, or depoſite his own judgment in reverence and deference to his Superiors in the Church, where his lot is fallen.* [Methinks he might better have

ſaid

ſaid, *where his obedience is due*: For, the Church, where his lot is fallen, may, by *Hereſie*, or *Schiſme*, ſtand divided from the Church Catholick.] Here he allows depoſiting of our judgment in deference to our Superiors, *where the Fundamentals of Faith, &c. are not concerned*; But would not one think rather, that in *theſe points* eſpecially a perſon, to be ſafe, ſhould adhere to the Churches judgment rather, than his own? Suppoſe a *Socinian* in the Point of *Conſubſtantiality*.

§. 295. n 3. || p. 170. Doctor *Jackſon* on the Creed, *l.* 2, §. 1 *c.* 6. *p.* 175. in ſtating the Queſtion. || *Whether the injunction of publick Eccleſiaſtical Authority may overſway any degree of our private perſwaſion concerning the unlawfulneſs of any opinion, or action*, goes on thus,—*Superiors* (ſaith he) *are to be obeyed in ſuch points as their Inferiors are not at leiſure to examine; or not of capacity to diſcern; or not of power or place to determine, whether they be lawful or no.* Again, *p.* 170. In caſe of an *Equilibrium* in ones perſwaſion, he argues thus. *Whereſoever the perſwaſions or probabilities of the goodneſs of any action are as great, as the perſwaſions and probabilities of the evill, that may enſue,—a lawful Governours command muſt in this caſe rule all private choice, either for doing, or omitting it.* The caſe is all one as in things meerly indifferent: for here is an indifferency of perſwaſions. But ſuppoſe we have not ſuch indifferency, yet, *p.* 172.—*Whilſt men of skill and judgment* (ſaith he) *appointed by God to adviſe in ſuch matters, are otherwiſe perſwaded than we in private are, the rule of Chriſtian modeſty binds us to ſuſpect our own perſwaſion, and conſequently to think there may be ſome good even in that action, wherein heretofore we thought was not.*—*And the performance of obedience it ſelf is a good, and acceptable action in the ſight of God.* [Now what he ſaith here concerning the *goodneſs* of an *action* holds as well concerning the *truth* of an *opinion*.] Again, *Ibid* p. 174.—*True ſpiritual obedience, were it rightly planted in our hearts, would bind us rather to like well of the things commanded for authorities ſake, than to diſobey authority for the private diſlike of them. Both our diſobedience* [*i. e.* diſſent, or non-ſubmiſſion of judgment] *to the one, and diſlike of the other, are unwarrantable, unleſs we can truly derive them from ſome formal contradiction or oppoſition between the publick or general injunction of Superiors, and expreſs law of the moſt High.*

And, *c.* 4. *p.* 165.—*Sundry* (ſaith he) *in profeſſion Proteſtants, in eagerneſs of oppoſition to the Papiſts, affirm; that the Church, or ſpiritual Paſtors muſt then only be believed, then only be obeyed, when they give ſentence according to the evident and expreſs law of God made evident to the heart, and conſciences of ſuch, as muſt believe*

and

and obey them. And this, in one word, is to take away all authority of ſpiritual Paſtors; and to deprive them of all obedience, unto whom doubtleſs God, by his word, hath given ſome ſpecial authority and right to exact ſome peculiar obedience of their Flock. Now if the Paſtor be then only to be obeyed, when he brings evident commiſſion out of the Scripture for thoſe particulars, unto which he demands belief or obedience, what obedience do men perform unto him more, than to any other man whatſoever? For whoſoever he be, that can ſhew us the expreſs undoubted command of God, it muſt be obeyed of all, But whilſt it is thus obeyed, it only; not he, that ſheweth it unto us, is obeyed. And if this were all the obedience, that I owe unto others, I were no more bound to believe or obey any other man, than he is bound to obey, or believe me: The Flock no more bound to obey the Paſtors, than the Paſtors, them. Yet certainly God, who hath ſet Kingdoms in order, is not the Author of ſuch confuſion in the ſpiritual regiment of his Church. Thus Doctor *Jackſon* tying all to obedience or ſubmiſſion to the judgment of their ſpiritual Guides, ſave only thoſe who are certain of a *formal contradiction* between God's Laws, and their Injunctions.

To this may be added that much noted place of Mr. *Hooker* §. 295. n. 4 in his *Preface* to *Eccleſiaſtical Policy*, §. 6. commenting there on *Deuteron.* 17. 8. &c. where it is ſaid, *ver* 11.—*According to the ſentence of the law which they ſhall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they ſhall tell thee, thou ſhalt do; thou ſhalt not decline from the ſentence which they ſhall ſhew thee to the right hand, nor to the left.*—*God was not ignorant* (ſaith he) *that the Prieſts and Judges, whoſe ſentence in matters of controverſie, he ordained, ſhould ſtand, both might, and oftentimes would, be deceived in their judgment. However, better it was in the eye of his underſtanding, that ſometimes an erroneous ſentence definitive ſhould prevail, till the ſame authority perceiving ſuch overſight, might afterwards correct, or reverſe it, than that ſtrifes ſhould have reſpit to grow, and not come ſpeedily to ſome end.* And here he anſwers the objection; that men muſt do nothing againſt conſcience, ſaying,—*Neither wiſh we, that men ſhould do any thing which in their hearts they are perſwaded they ought not to do: But we ſay, this perſwaſion ought to be fully ſettled in their hearts, that, in litigious and controverted cauſes of ſuch quality, the will of God is, to have them to do, whatſoever the ſentence of judicial, and final deciſion ſhall determine; yea, though it ſeem in their private opinion* [*i. e.* according to their own reaſon and arguments drawn *à parte rei*] *to ſwerve utterly from that which is right: as, no doubt, many times the ſentence amongſt the Jews did, unto one, or other, part contending. And yet in this caſe, God did*

then

then allow them to do that, which in their private judgment ſeemed, yea and perhaps truly ſeemed, that the law did diſallow. For, if God be not the Author of confuſion but of peace, &c. And again, —*Not, that I judge it a thing allowable for men to obſerve theſe laws, which in their hearts they are ſtedfaſtly perſwaded to be againſt the law of God; But their perſwaſion in this caſe* [i. e. where their Superiors have determined otherwiſe.] *they are bound for the time* [i. e. till the ſame Authority reverſe it and releaſe them] *to ſuſpend*, &c.—*unleſs they have an infallible Demonſtration.* Thus he. Where, you ſee, he grounds their yielding to Authority, and changing their former perſwaſion, upon an *non-certainty* of ſuch perſwaſion. As for his limited expreſſion before,—*in litigious and controverted cauſes of ſuch quality*, whatever he meaneth thereby, the Commiſſion and Injunction, *Deut.* 17. extends to *all* litigious, and controverted cauſes whatſoever; As alſo it is more clearly drawn, 2 *Chron.* 19. 5, 8, 10, 11. Where it runs, —*What cauſe ſoever ſhall come to you of your brethren between blood and blood, between law and commandment, ſtatutes and judgments, ye ſhall* &c. And note alſo, that the command, *Deut* 17. 10. *Thou ſhalt obſerve to do according to all that they inform thee*, requires not only a *paſsive* (willingly paying mulcts or undergoing puniſhments) but *active*, obedience: Again, an *active* obedience, not only in doing ſomething thought by me *lawful*, but to which I think I am *not obliged*; but in doing alſo of ſomething, where the *lawfulneſs* of it is queſtioned by me; which thing alſo, here by the text, I am to do, if they command me. And therefore after ſuch Injunction I ought to alter my former perſwaſion concerning it, and to believe, either that *in general* it is lawful to be done, or at leaſt lawful to be done *by me*, not certain of the contrary, *rebus ſic ſtantibus*, and ſuch ſentence paſt.

§. 296. To all theſe teſtimonies concerning the obligation which *illiterat* and *ignorant*, or alſo, though *learned*, after much examination, *doubting* and *unſatisfied*, perſons have to ſubmit their judgment to Church-Authority, I may add the apparent *miſchiefs* which follow the contrary, obſerved amongſt *Proteſtants* (neglecting this duty) from the beginning of the *Reformation*, *Luther* himſelf much lamenting the *diviſions* he ſaw among his Diſciples even in his own daies,—*Ego* (ſaith he †) *qui jam ſum in miniſterio Chriſti viginti annis, quanquam nihil ſum, vere poſſum teſtari, me plus quam viginti ſectis eſſe petitum*, &c. And, in *Gen. c.* 6. publiſhed not long before his death. *Quantum ſectarum excitavit Satan nobis viventibus? Quid futurum eſt nobis mortuis? Profecto tota agmina Sacramentariorum, Anabaptiſtarum, Antinomorum,*

† *Præfat. comment. in Galat.*

morum, Servetianorum, Campaniſtarum, &c. And himſelf alſo is much noted for his varying from himſelf in his opinions often changed. But ſtill theſe diviſions are more apparent in the longer courſe of his Schiſme; which *daily* multiplies and brancheth its ſelf into more and more cleſts and ſects, and ſome of them moſt groſs, and ridiculous, and for which it is hard to find names; and which their forſaken Leaders are much aſhamed of, whilſt the Plebeians will neither ſtudy truth themſelves, nor follow the learned; The miſtakes of theſe perſons in ſuch high and Divine matters, being *greater*, as their *ſcience leſs*: and their opinions, ſince weakly grounded *floating* and *unconſtant*: and, from the uſually prevailing intereſts of the fleſh, inclined to *liberty* and *ſenſuality*.

§. 297. Grotius

Of which *Diviſions*, *Grotius*, in ſeveral of his writings, ſadly complains, as cauſed by this, that they will pitch upon no *Superior* and *common* authority, by which they will be content to be guided, and regulated in their Faith.—*Proteſtantes* (ſaith he in his laſt reply to *Rivet* †) *nullo inter ſe communi eccleſiaſtico regimine ſociantur: quæ cauſa ſunt, Cur facta partes in unam Proteſtantium corpus colligi nequeant; immo & cur Partes aliæ atq; aliæ ſint exurrecturæ.* And in the *Preface* to his *Votum pro Pace*, ſpeaking of their primitive Diſſentments.—*Confeſſiones* (ſaith he) *factæ ſunt variis in locis variæ, atque inter ſe pugnantes: & non modo quæ facta erant partes non potuere unquam inter ſe coaleſcere, ſed & novæ quotidie exortæ ſunt particulæ tot, ut nemo ſit, qui earum inire poſſit numerum: & ut facunda eſt iſta ſeges* (*unoquoque ſibi licere credente, quod alius ante uſurpavit*) *credibile eſt, novas quotidie exituras.* A preſage at this time too much verified in this our Nation. But *Dudithius*, the famous Biſhop of *Quinqueccleſiæ* in his diſconſolate Letter to *Beza*, when *Dudithius* now a Proteſtant, and married, and beginning to ſtagger in his new Religion, that had diſpenſed with his Celibacy, much more deplores theſe their inteſtine diſcords, and ſchiſmes in a ſciſme. There, † —*Si quæ aliquando* (ſaith he) *inter eruditos, ex quodam diſputationis quaſi calore, Controverſiæ extiterunt, illis ſtatim Concilii, ſive etiam Pontificis, decreta finem impoſuerunt. At noſtri quales tandem ſunt? palantes, omni doctrinæ vento agitati, & in altum ſublati, modo ad hanc, modo ad illam, partem differuntur. Horum quæ ſit hodie de Religione ſententia, ſcire ſortaſſe poſſis; ſed quæ eras de eadem futura ſit opinio, neque ille, neque tu certo affirmare queas.* Again,—*Eccleſiæ ipſæ pugnant inter ſe capitalibus odiis, & horrendis quibuſdam Anathematiſmis* [perhaps looking at the Diſſentions then between the followers of *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Oecolampadius*, *Calvin*,

† *Apolog. Diſcuſſio p.* 255.

Dudithig-

† *Apud Becaw. Epiſt.* 1.

Calvin, &c. not yet healed.] *Ipſi, qui ſummum haberi volunt, Theologi, à ſeipſis indies diſſident: fidem cudunt, & à ſuâ ipſius, quam paulo ante profeſſi fuerant, & ab aliorum omnium, fide abhorrentem; deniq; menſtruam fidem habent* [perhaps looking at the often varyings of *Luther*, *Melancthon*, *Bucer*, and others, from their own former opinions, and doctrine.] Thus *Dudithius*. For, though the Churches make ſome particular ſtanding *Articles* to bind together their own Subjects, yet both the Articles of the ſeveral Churches do not accord one with another, in ſome principal Points (as appears in the Lutheran, Calviniſt, Belgick, French, Engliſh, reformed Churches;) and the *Subjects* of each *Church* do, upon the reforming Principles, without ſcruple, break theſe *Bonds*, upon any new greater veriſimilities, thinking their *Chriſtian liberty* infringed by them. And certainly, whatever deviation from *Truth*, and *former Tradition*, we may ſuppoſe the firſt *Reformers* to have made, yet if they could have reſtrained the people their Subjects from following their example, and from taking that liberty of diſſenting from them, which they, being alſo Subjects, took of diſſenting from their Superiors, both the whole Body of the Reformation would have had much more unity and peace, and ſuch perſons much leſs error.

§. 298. 2. Advanced thus far (learned Proteſtants conſenting) That all ſuch perſons, as we here ſpeak of, are to conform to, and to ſuffer themſelves, in matters of Religion, to be guided by Church Authority: Next, a Judgment freed from the intereſts of the Will, may eaſily further add: That where theſe Eccleſiaſtical Governours happen to differ amongſt themſelves, and guide a contrary way, here, ſince theſe are placed, for avoiding ſchiſmes, in a due ſubordination, ſuch perſons, in ſuch caſe, owe their obedience to the Superiors of them: To which, in all regular Governments, the inferior Magiſtrates, if they do not, ought to give place.—*Si aliquid* (ſaith St. *Auſtin* †) *Proconſul jubeat, & aliud jubeat Imperator, nunquid dubitatur, iſto contempto, illi eſſe ſerviendum?* [*i. e.* in things, which our Eccleſiaſtical Guides do not inſtruct us to be contrary to the Divine Laws.] So, as to ſpiritual matters, and the ſence of Scripture, a Provincial, and a National, Synod guiding ſuch perſons ſeveral waies, their obedience is due to the National; again, a National, and a Patriarch Council of all the Weſt, or a General, determining matters in a diverſe manner, the obedience of ſuch perſons is due to the Patriarchal, or General, not the National, Council. And the ſame it is, in any Patriarchy, or Province, in the intervals of Synods, as to the ſubordinate Paſtors and Prelats.

† De verbis Dom. Serm. 6.

See

See the obedience required by the Church of *England* from all inferior Clergie, or Synods, to a National Council, in the Canons made, 1603. *Can.* 139. and 140.—*Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the sacred Synod of this Nation is not the true Church of* England *by representation.*—*Or, that no manner of person either of the Clergy or Laity, not being themselves particularly assembled in the said sacred Synod, are to be subject to the decrees thereof, &c. let him be Excommunicated.* And as of persons, so Churches.—*That Church* (saith Bishop *Bramhal* †) *which shall not outwardly acquiesce, after a legal determination* [*i. e.* of its Superiors] *and cease to disturb Christian unity, though her judgment may be sound, her practice is schismatical.* And elsewhere † —*If a Superior presume to determine contrary to the determination of the Church* [*i. e.* of his Ecclesiastical Superiors] *it is not rebellion but loyalty to disobey him* [and obey them.] And,—*I acknowledge* (saith Dr. *Hammond* †) *as much as* C. G. *or any man, the Authority of a General Council against the dissent of a Nation, much more of a particular Bishop.* And, in his Book of *Schisme*, p. 54. and 66. He grants it Schism, for the Bishop to withdraw his obedience from the higher power of the Metropolitan, or Primate, as well as for Presbyters, from the Bishop. Now from these I collect, that if these inferior Synods, or Clergy, are to yield such external obedience to their respective Superiors; Then are the Subjects of these, when ever a lower Church-Authority clasheth with an higher (either in submission of their judgment, or of their silence) to adhere to the higher; nor are the one freed from this duty, because the other neglect it. So some National, and a Patriarchal Council dissenting, or some Metropolitan, and his Patriarch; here the forenamed persons, being the Subjects of both, owe their submission of judgment only to the higher Church-Authority of the two; which Authority if the forecited Protestants allow the lower to *dissent* from, yet not to *gain-say*.

† *Schism guared, p.* 2

† *Vindic. of Church of* Engl. *p.* 12.

† *Knew. to Cath. Genti. c.* 8. § 1.

§. 299. Nor is it reasonable for any to decline here the present Supreme Authority, that is extant, and in being; and transfer such his obedience, and submission to a future, that hath no being; as to transfer it from his Primate, or Patriarch, or so large and universal Councils, as have been convened in his own, or in former times, to a future, absolutely General, Council; For thus, so many only are subject to the present supreme Powers, as are content to be so, if an appeale to a future Authority streighr unties them from it. And yet more unreasonable this, if this appeale is to such a future Council, as probably can never be;

namely, where either the Aſſembly, or the approbation of it, muſt be *abſolutely Univerſal*, either as to the whole Body of Chriſtian Biſhops; or, at leaſt, as to ſome Biſhops of every Province; an uſual demand of the Reformed. For ſuch Provinces as are cenſured, or condemned by the Council (which thing often happens) it cannot be preſumed, that they will ever accept it: No more than the Council of *Trent* ſuppoſed never ſo univerſal as to the reſt of Chriſtianity, would have been accepted by the Proteſtant Biſhops, who fell under its cenſures.

§. 300, But, if the preſent ſupreme Church-Authority in actual being is that, to which ſuch perſons, in any conteſts of Superiors, alwaies owe their ſubmiſſion, the moſt of thoſe, who have not skill to comprehend or decide to themſelves *Controverſies*, yet have light enough to diſcern this their *Superior Guide*: For example: Whether a Patriarch, or a Primate be of an higher authority: Whether an Occidental Council at *Trent*, under *Pius*: Or a National at *London*, under K. *James* be the Superior and more comprehenſive, and univerſal: For the Subordinations of Clergy, and their Synods are well known: and, amongſt Sects, that are in corners, the Church-Catholick ſtands like *a City ſet on a hill*, and *a light on a Candleſtick*. —*Qua uſque ad confeſsionem generis humani, ab Apoſtolicâ ſede per ſucceſsiones Epiſcoporum, fruſtra Hæreticis circumlatrantibus*, &c. (as St. *Auſtin* before, §. 293.) *culmen authoritatis obtinuit*; and which its very Adverſaries ſhew (but as an intolerable ambition in it) to be that body, which challengeth, in our Lords name, obedience from all the world Chriſtian, and, hitherto, hath out-numbred any other Chriſtian Society of one Communion. For all *Sects*, as they divide from it, ſo alſo moſt certainly (from the ſame continued liberty againſt Authority) among themſelves. And therefore, though ſuch others, as by their mean education, and low imployments, know no more of the Church, its Governours, or Doctrine, than what their Pariſh Prieſt (perhaps factious) teacheth them; and ſo, without aſcending higher, here terminate their obedience, may be excuſed by invincible ignorance for a thing, that is their *unhappineſs* indeed, but not their *crime*; yet thoſe, who by their more liberal Education, and ingenuous imployments, cannot be inculpably ignorant of ſuch Authority, and whoſe example the ruder ſort are ſteered by, if they neglect to range themſelves under it, ſhall bear their own judgment, and alſo that of their followers. And, if any Authority, canonically ſubject to another, ſhall rebel againſt it, and declare it ſelf, as to ſome part of the Church, ſupreme; and will govern that

that part independently, what leſs can it expect from the Divine Juſtice, than that its Subjects, likewiſe animated by its example, ſhould revolt from it; and as it reforms for it ſelf, againſt others above it, ſo it ſhould ſuffer more Reformations ſtill, for themſelves, from others below it; and the meaſure meted by it to others be meted again by others to it; till all divine matters, not on a ſuddain (which is not the ordinary courſe of God's long-ſuffering) but in proceſs of time, be brought, in ſuch part, to confuſion and Anarchy.

§. 301. This from §. 292. 1. That ſuch, as are wholy unſtudied in Controverſies; or, after reading them, ſtill unſatisfied, are to ſubmit their judgments to the *preſent* Church-Authority; 2. And then, this divided, to the higheſt in actual being; which without much ſearch cannot but be known to the greateſt part of Chriſtians.

3. Next, as to Church-Authority *paſt*, with which many would evacuate the preſent, here alſo ſuch, as cannot ſearch and examine; or, in examining, cannot clear to themſelves its certain Traditions, ought alſo, concerning it, to take the judgment of the *preſent* Church; for, whoſe can they prudently prefer to it? But yet, give me leave to add one thing more, that without looking into the Ancients themſelves, for which few have leiſure, or Books, ſuch perſons may eaſily diſcern by many other Symptoms, and evidences, and by their travelling no further, than the modern writings, on what ſide Antiquity ſtands, as to matters of religion in preſent debate, and which of the oppoſite parties it is, that hath deſerted, and receded from it. Of whom you may ſee what hath been ſaid already to this purpoſe, in 3 *Diſc.* §. 78.) 3.

§. 302. 1. For firſt, He, that is acquainted only with the modern writings, will find the one party, in general, much claiming, and vindicating *liberty* of *Opinion*, of *Judgment*, of *Conſcience*; and indeavouring to prove the *Fallibility* of whatever *Authority*, whereas the other, generally, preſſeth obedience, and adherence to Authority; and defends the Infallibility alſo of it, as to all neceſſaries. Which argues, that ſuch Authority pincheth the one, promotes the other.

§. 303. 2. Again, As to this Church-authority paſt, whether taken collectively in its Councils; or disjunctively, the particular Fathers: As to the firſt, He will find the one party, * uſually diſparaging, and weakening, upon ſome pretence or other, moſt of thoſe Councils, formerly held in the Church: * Requiring ſuch conditions of their power to oblige obedience, as indeed neither

ther paſt Councils were, nor future can be, capable of; I mean either, as to ſuch an univerſal Convention; or acceptation, as this Party demands, He will find them * urging much the Non-neceſſity of Councils; the difficulty to know, the right qualifications of the perſons; the legality of their proceedings; the ſence of their Decrees: * Quarrelling about the calling of them; the preſiding in them; the paucity of their members; inequality of Nations: Pretending their contradictions (*Councils againſt Councils*, ſaith Mr. *Chillingw.*†) their being led by a faction; * carping at their *Anathema's*; even thoſe of the very firſt Councils. [—*The Fathers of the Church* (ſaith Mr. *Chillingw.*†) *in after times* [*i. e.* after the Apoſtles] *might have juſt cauſe to declare their judgments touching the ſence of ſome general Articles of the Creed. But to oblige others to receive their Declarations, under pain of damnation* [*i. e.* of Anathema] *what warrant they had, I know not. He that can ſhew, either that the Church of all ages was to have this Authority; or, that it continued in the Church for ſome ages* [*viz.* for the four firſt General Councils] *and then expired, let him; for my part, I cannot.* Thus he;] Queſtioning their making more new Articles of Faith, after the declaration of the Third General Council at *Epheſus* againſt it. All theſe, I ſay, are manifeſt Indications concerning ſuch *Queſtioners*, that the fore-paſt Councils are no friends to their cauſe.

†p. 376.
‡p. 200.

§. 304. 3. Next; For the *Fathers* apart; he will find the ſame Party* frequent in alledging the corruptions, and interpolations of thoſe writings, which it confeſſeth theirs; * affirming ſeveral writings, which the reſt of the world admits for genuine, to be ſuppoſititious, and none of theirs, will find them * complaining ſometimes of their obſcurity; ſometimes of their Rhetorick, and Allegories (which occaſion often a miſtake of their opinion;) and their uſing terms in a much other ſenſe, than the modern do: *Repreſenting them, as to the many matters now in Controverſie, impertinent, or ambiguous, confuſed, not clear, (by their own judgment then, the Fathers not clear on their ſide:) * Diſcovering their *nakedneſs* as much as they can; and laying open their errors, Repugnances and Contradictions: Contradictions of one to another; of the ſame to himſelf; —[*Some Fathers againſt others, the ſame Fathers againſt themſelves: A conſent of Fathers of one age againſt a conſent of Fathers of another age; the Church of one age againſt the Church of another age*; ſaith Mr. *Chillingw.*] * Allowing certain Tradition hardly of any thing, ſave of the H. Scriptures; And, few, or no, *Traditive* interpretations thereof. I have the words from Mr. *Chillingw.*. [*No Tradition*

‖p. 376.

(ſaith

(ſaith he †) *but only of Scripture can derive it ſelf from the Foun-* † *p.* 376.
tain [our Lord and his Apoſtles:] *but may be plainly proved, either to have been brought in, in ſuch an age, after Chriſt; or, that in ſuch an age it was not in.* And,—*Traditive Interpretations of Scripture are pretended; but there are few, or none to be found.* So he. * Alledging, that the Fathers tranferred ſeveral conceits and cuſtoms, into the Church, from their new-deſerted Paganiſm; Platonick philoſophy; And Divinity of the Sybils: or at leaſt out of compliance with ſuch new Heathen Converts: And then, that the more prudent and ſober Fathers, through timorouſneſs and deſpair of a reformation, have complied with the reſt, and been carried down with the ſtream. Thus *Zuinglius* † of S. *Auſtin*, touching Corporal Preſence (in which point many Proteſtants would have him their Patron) — *Facile adducimur* (ſaith he) *Auguſtinum, præ aliis acuto, perſpicacique ingenio virum, ſuâ tempeſtate non fuiſſe auſum diſerte veritatem proloqui, quæ jam caſum magnâ parte dederat. Vidit omnino pius Homo, quid hoc Sacramentum eſſet; & in quem uſum eſſet inſtitutum; verum invaluerat opinio de Corporeâ carne.* And thus *Chemnitius* || of the ſame Father, touching Invocation of Saints,—*Hæc Auguſtinus, ſine Scripturâ; temporibus & conſuetudini cedens.* And *Bochart. Origin. de l' Invoc. p.* 488.—*St.* Auſtin (*who ſeems to have been of a diſpoſition wonderfully ſweet and courteous*) *ſuffers himſelf often to comply with the common errors, and ſuperſtitions, indeavouring rather to put a good ſenſe upon them, than to croſs them,* &c. And,—*Tantæ vir authoritatis in negocio Dei libere loqui non audebat.*—*Cum præſumptionibus omnia impleri videret, ſchiſmatis metu, aperte damnare non audebat,* ſaith *Voſſius* †] Again, * ſaying, they held many things only as probabilities, which later times have advanced into matters of faith, and that neceſſary. He finds them alſo, in *Appeale* to this *Antiquity*, aſcending rather to the 3 firſt ages thereof; *ages* wherein the Church was perſecuted; and few Records are left of her general Doctrines, or Practices; and more willingly declining the later; where the Records many; and the Church, in her flouriſhing condition, more fully diſplaying to the world all her Government and Diſcipline; theſe men confeſſing ſome appearances of ſeveral of the Tenents and Cuſtoms, they oppoſe, in the fourth age. Laſtly he finds them, apt to change the phraſe, and language of the Ancients; and bogling at many of their terms [ſuch as thoſe of *Merit, Satisfaction, Altars, Prieſts, Sacrifices,* &c.] which novelty of words often argues a new conceit of things,

† *De verâ & falſâ Religione. p.* 214.

|| *Exam. Con. Trid. 3 part. p.* 197.

† *Theſ. de Invocat. S.*

This

This the Proteſtants behaviour to Antiquity (in relating which, thoſe who are verſed in their books of Controverſie, eſpecially the writings of the French, know, that I falſifie nothing,) whereas on the other ſide, the oppoſite party to this he finds uſually defending thoſe works of the Fathers, which the others queſtion; and not diſcarding Records certainly ancient, becauſe perhaps ſome of them miſ-entitled as to the *Author*, or ſomewhat antidated as to the *time*: Again ſtating their Theological queſtions, and extracting their Comments on Scripture controverted, out of their writings: Covering their defects: and charitably interpreting what, in them is any way capable thereof, and reconciling their ſeeming Contradictions: Laſtly *Sainting* the Fathers, and ſolemnly commemorating them in their publick ſervice: Often urging, and laying much weight on ancient Tradition, and ſo keeping ſtable, and firm from generation to generation, the Doctrine and Faith of the Church, and, out of this Tradition, convincing Hereſies: Defending the legal authority of thoſe Councils, which the other oppoſe; and gathering their Canons into certain Heads for the ſtanding Laws and Rules of preſent-Church Government: Not looking back with ſuch rigor and jeâlouſie upon their ſupreme Judges, and examining their numbers, their Commiſſions, Elections (if theſe free from Simony) Ordinations, nay Baptiſm: nor holding them of more virtue, authority, or illumination, as to the deciding of Controverſies, or enlarging Creeds, in one age, than another; but, in all ages, alike neceſſary, alike aſſiſted.

§. 305.

4. But, yet further; He may diſcover the pretence to the Fathers, that is made by this party of late, not to have been ſo much, in the beginning of the Reformation. See before, §. 104. and 128. in the times of the Council of *Trent*, their plain refuſing to be tried by the *Councils, Fathers, Church-Tradition*, but as theſe are firſt proved to have founded their Doctrine in the Scriptures.

u See alſo Cavilon. Conſtitut. p. 219. Guide in Contr. p. 219.

See the two Heads thereof, *Luther* and *Calvin*, their plain dealing in this matter in the many Quotations cited out of them before, *Diſc.* 3. §. 78. *n.* 3. &c. — *Quanti errores* (ſaith *Luther*) *in omnium Patrum ſcriptis inventi ſunt? Quoties ſibi ipſis pugnant? Quis eſt, qui non ſæpius ſcripturas torſerit?* &c. And, *contra Regem Angliæ* — *Non ego quæro* (ſaith he) *quid Ambroſius, Auguſtinus Concilia, & uſus ſæculorum, dicunt,* — *Miranda eſt ſtultitia Satanæ, quæ iis me impugnat, quæ ego impugno.* And, *lib. de miniſtris Eccl. inſtituend.* — *Non habent Papiſtæ quod his opponant* [*i. e.* to his private ſence, and expoſition of Holy Scriptures] *niſi*

|| *In aſſertione Articul.*

niſi, Patres, Concilia, Conſuetudinem. [Is not that enough?] *Calvin, De Eccleſiæ reformandæ ratione*, c. 19. to the judgement of Antiquity urged againſt him in the point, *De ſacrificio & Miſſâ*, returns ſuch general anſwers as theſe, not unfrequent with him alſo concerning many other points.—*Veterum ſententias non moror, quas ad obruendam veritatem hic congerunt Moderatores. Solemne eſt nebulonibus iſtis* [you muſt pardon his heat, like that of *Luther*] *quicquid vitioſum in Patribus legitur, corradere.* And below.—*Deſinant boni Moderatores veterum ſententiis pugnare, in malâ cauſâ.* Again,—*Non eſt, quod vel Ambroſium, vel alium quempiam ex totâ veterum cohorte, acutius vidiſſe putemus, quam ipſum Apoſtolum.* Again,—*Ut millies clament Papiſtæ, oblatum olim fuiſſe panem; veteres ita ſolitos facere; non novam eſſe conſuetudinem; toties excipere nobis licebit: Chriſti mandatum inviolabilem eſſe regulam, quæ nullâ hominum conſuetudine, nullâ præſcriptione temporum, convelli, aut refigi debeat.* And,—*Quod ad veteres ſpectat; non eſt quod, in eorum gratiam, ab æterna, & inflexibili Dei veritate* [*i. e.* his own fancies concerning God's Truth] *recedamus.* And, concerning the ignorance or negligence of the Fathers in the main points of our ſalvation, *Mans ſervitude under ſin; Reconciliation to God; Juſtification; the effects* of Chriſts *Death*, and *Interceſſions*, thus he, in his anſwer to *Caſſander's offic. pii viri* ‖—*Si, quid in controverſiam vocetur, quia flexibile eſt το ετερογενον inſtar naſi cerei, ſi abſque traditionis* [*i. e.* Patrum] *ſubſidio, quicquam definire fas non ſit, Quid jam fiet præcipuis fides noſtræ capitibus?* Tria ſolum exempli cauſâ, *præferam*, 1 *Naturæ noſtræ corruptio, & miſera animæ ſervitus ſub peccati tyrannide*; 2 *Gratuita Juſtificatio*; & 3 *Chriſti ſacerdotium, apud vetuſtiſſimos ſcriptores, ita obſcure attingitur, ut nulla inde certitudo poſsit elici.—Satan callidè ſpinoſis quæſtionibus pios Doctores intricabat, ut negligentiores eſſent in hac parte. Quoniam vero errores, quibus profligandis tunc circumagebantur, magna ex parte ſunt obſoleti, mediocrem duntaxat fructum percipimus ex eorum libris. Interea, ſi ex eorum Traditione haurienda ſit cognitio ſalutis noſtræ, jacebit omnis* fiducia: *quia ex illis nunquam diſcemus, quomodo Deo reconciliemur; quomodo illuminemur à ſpiritu Sancto; & formemur in obſequium Juſtitiæ; quomodo gratis accepta nobis feratur Chriſti obedientia; quid valeat ſacrificium mortis ejus, & continua pro nobis interceſſio*, &c. The knowledge of ſuch things (ſurely the chief principles of our ſalvation) not to be learnt out of the Fathers. And, that you may not think, that herein *Calvins* cenſure ſtands ſingle; before this man, *Melancthon*, ſpeaking of *Luthers* new diſcovery to the world of the Apoſtolical Doctrine in the very ſame points, in his Preface to the ſecond Tome of *Luthers*

‖ *Apud Caſſand. p. 802.*

thers works, thus pleaseth himself in the rare invention thereof. *Eruditis* (saith he) *gratum erat, quasi ex tenebris educi Christum, Prophetas, Apostolos; conspici discrimen Legis, & Evangelii, promissionum legis, & promissionis Evangelicæ: Quod certe non extabat in Thoma, Scoto, & similibus* [This throws off the Schoolmen, the Disciples of the Fathers:] But he stayes not here; till he hath hunted up the same error, and mistake, in these matters, in the Fathers too, as high as *Origens* time.— *Origenica ætas* (saith he) *effudit hanc persuasionem; mediocrem rationis disciplinam mereri remissionem peccatorum*, &c. And,— *Hæc ætas pene amisit totum discrimen Legis & Evangelii; & sermonem Apostolicum dedidicit* [Now, who, here, could have the boldness to imbrace a *way* of *Justification* or Salvation, though pretended never so rational or scriptural; yet which is, withal confessed (if not also boasted of) after so many ages of the Church, that it is a *new Discovery*?]

Descend we to others of the same, more free and open, times. *Peter Martyr*, in his common Places, writing *De Patrum Authoritate* || alledgeth,— *Statim ab Apostolorum temporibus capisse errores.*— *Quum ergo volumus* (saith he) *instaurare Ecclesiam, nihil consultius est, quam omnia revocare ad prima ecclesiæ principia, & religionis primordia. Quamdiu enim consistimus in Conciliis, & Patribus, versabimur semper in iisdem erroribus.* Again,— *Quid fecerunt Antiquissimi illi scriptores, cum nulli adhuc essent Patres? Si tum ecclesia judicabat ex verbo, & spiritu, cur nunc quoque ita non potest judicare?* [which Question is soon answered: that the Fathers *Fathers* were the Apostles; and that they judged *ex verbo, & spiritu, & Traditione Apostolorum*, for the sence of the same Scriptures, where dubious.] Again,— *Provocare à Scripturis* [he must mean, for what is the true sence of Scripture] *ad Patres, est provocare à certis ad incerta, à claris ad obscura, à firmis ad infirma.* — *Et aliud, quod dixi, potissimum spectandum est; Patres non semper congruere inter se: & interdum, ne unum quidem ipsum convenire secum.* [Would any thus prejudice the witnesses he intends to bring into the Court for his own cause?] Again,— *Objiciunt nobis Paulum, in Ep. ad Tim. appellare ecclesiam Columnam veritatis. Fateor. Est quidem Columna veritatis. Sed non semper. Verum, quando nititur verbo Dei.* [But, thus is the most ignorant person that can be named, *Columna veritatis.*] So *Peter Martyr.* Bishop *Juel*, our Countryman, (as the English Divines, who have departed less from *Antiquity* than other forrain Protestant Churches, seem also more desirous of being reputed to keep a fair correspondence with it) in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* daies,

|| *Cless.4 c.4.*

in

in his challenge at *Pauls* Cross, proposed no less than 27. Articles of Religion, wherein he offered to be tried by the Fathers of the first six hundred years: But then, it is very observable; that this learned man hath chosen them so warily, that of the twentyseven, twenty two are concerning the Eucharist; and again, most of these, only about circumstantials therein: and, in these concerning the Eucharist, he omits, the Oblation of the *Eucharist*, as a *Sacrifice*, to God the Father (only contends, *Art.* 17. no offering up, therein, of *Christ* unto his Father:) omits also the *reservation* of the *Eucharist*, after Communion ended. Omits also the most, if not all, the other principal points that are in Controversie: As *Invocation of Saints. Purgatory, and Prayer for the Dead. Veneration of sacred Relicks. Evangelical Councils. Monastick Vows. Celibacy of the Clergy.* The *Roman* Doctrine concerning *Justification, Freewill and Merits*, concerning *Penances*, and *Satisfactions*. Concerning *Auricular Confession. Distinction* of *venial* and *mortal* sin, &c. His silence in which, arguing the Fathers not for, but against, Him, seems to have done much more *prejudice* to his cause, than his confident challenge for the other, hath done it *credit*. This thing Dr. *Cole*, then a Prisoner, observed, and in a Letter expostulated with him: *Quod minutiora attigerit, graviora praetermiserit*, † who return'd this answer, — *Quaestiones se primum leviores moviisse, ut post ad alia dogmata veniretur: Alia* [i. e. the points he omitted] *esse ejusmodi, ad quae probanda Conciliorum & Patrum authoritates quadam obtendi possint. Haec, quae ab ipso sunt posita, — nullum colorem probabilitatis habere*, &c. And Dr. *Humphrey* (*Vita Juelli, p.* 212.) seems not very well pleased with this challenge of *Juels*, where he saith, — *Tamen nimium largitus est, & vobis plus aequo concesserit, & sibi nimium fuit injurius, quod rejecto medio*, [i. e. the Scriptures] *quo causam suam facilius & firmius sustentare potuisset, & seipsum, & ecclesiam quodammodo spoliavit.* — *Satis enim erat Christiano, sic dixisse*: Sic dicit Dominus. *Satis erat, opposuisse*; Vestra dogmata Scripturis adversantur. *Siquidem Daemoniacorum quaestio est*: Quid nobis, & tibi, Jesu, fili David? *At sanctorum interrogatio est: Quid rei nobis cum Patribus, cum carne, aut sanguine? Aut quid ad nos attinet, quod Episcoporum pseudo-Synodi constituunt? &c.*

† See Dr. *Humphrey vita Juelli*, p. 132.

§. 306. In those more confident times also, the *Centuristis* freely set down in the several ages the *errors* of the *Fathers*, which, in the modern Controversies, misled the latter *Roman*, and *Greek* Churches. *Hospinian* in the Preface to his *Histor. Sacrament.* to Antiquity urged as opposing the new reformed opinions, and

practices, returns for anſwer, *the command in the Prophet *Jeremy*,—*In ſtatutis Patrum veſtrorum nolite ambulare*: And * that ſaying of our Lord,—*Sine cauſa colunt me, mandata & doctrinas hominum docentes*; and * that of St. *Cyprian*,—*Conſuetudo, ſine veritate, vetuſtas erroris eſt*; and of S. *Auſtin*,—*Antiquitatem præjudicare veritati nec poſſe, nec debere.* The forementioned *Dudithius* in his diſcontented Epiſtle to *Beza*.†—*Si veritas eſt*, (ſaith he) *quam veteres Patres mutuo conſenſu ſunt profeſſi, ea à Pontificiis tota ſtabit.*

† See *Beza Epiſt.* 1.

§. 337. And ſeveral later Proteſtants and other Diſſenters from the Church of *Rome*, there are, who have been ingenuous in the ſame confeſſion. *Grotius* in the beginning of his *Votum pro pace*, giving an account of his reading of the Fathers.—*Collegi* (ſaith he) *quæ eſſent illa, quæ veterum teſtimonio, & manentibus in hunc diem veſtigiis, ſemper & ubique, & perſeveranter, eſſent tradita; videbam ea manere in illa eccleſia, quæ Romanæ connectitur. Iſ. Cauſabon* (cited by *Arnauld*, in his late anſwer to *Claude* an Hugenot Miniſter, with many others, which you may view in his 1. *Book* 5. *chap.*) in his Epiſtle to *Witenbogard*,† *præſtantium virorum Epiſtolæ* written, 1610 a little before his coming into *England*, when he ſeems to have been in ſome greater diſſettlement, ſpeaks thus. *Deum toto affectu veneror, ut mala eccleſiæ ſuæ qui poteſt ſolus velit, Sanare. Me, ne quid diſſimulem, hæc tanta diverſitas* (in Proteſtants) *à fide veteris eccleſiæ non parum turbat. Ne de aliis dicam, in re ſacramentorum à majoribus diſceſſit Lutherus, &c.* Then ſpeaking of *Peter du Moulin* his making (as other Proteſtants uſually do) thoſe Tracts of the Fathers, that are urged to confirm the Roman Doctrine, ſpurious and counterfeit, As. *S. Ambroſe de ſacramentis*,—*Cyril Heroſol. Catechet. Myſtagog.*—*Gregory Nyſſens* Catechetical Oration, he thus goes on,—*Jam, quod idem Molinæus omnes veterum libros ſuæ doctrinæ contrarios reſpuit, ut* ὑποβολιμαίους *cui mediocriter docto fidem faciet? Falſus illi Cyrillus* [*Hieroſolymitanus*, *falſus Gr. Nyſſenus, falſus Ambroſius, falſi omnes: mihi liquet falli ipſum; & illa ſcripta eſſe veriſſima, quæ ipſe pronunciat* Ψευδεπίγραφα. Thus *Cauſabon*;

† §. 207.

† §. 297.

§. 308. 1. More general yet that confeſſion of *Socinus*, *Ep. ad Radecium. Legantur* (ſaith he) *Pontificiorum ſcripta adverſus Lutheranos, & Calvinianos, & ſatis intelliget, ſi, præter ſacras literas, illorum* [*Patrum*, produced by the *Pontificii*] *authoritate ſit ſtandum, nobis omnino cauſa cadendum eſſe.* And indeed the followers of *Socinus*, deſpairing as to their chief points concerning God's Attributes, and the Trinity, to produce any juſt plea from ancient Church-Authority, do alſo, more candidly, relinquiſh this intereſt as to thoſe other Controverſies

troverſies, which they, in common with other reformed, maintain againſt Catholicks. In defending which points, when the Fathers are urged againſt them, their ordinary anſwer is: [1] That Error and Antichriſt came into the Church ſo ſoon as the Apoſtles by death went out of it: And therefore they make even the Apoſtles themſelves, not the Roman Empire, (for that, they ſay, would keep out Antichriſt too long) to be the ὁ κατέχων 2 *Theſſ.* 2. [2] That the Fathers would have the Holy Scriptures to be believed, rather than any thing they ſay. [3] That the Fathers are not to be believed in any thing they ſay contrary to the Scriptures: and that, if Antiquity be to be followed, the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles* are the moſt ancient; [theſe perſons, impudently, calling by the *name* of Prophets, Apoſtles, Scriptures, that private ſenſe they impoſe upon them] See for this *Volkelius de vera Relig. l.* 3. *c.* 40.—and *l.* 4. c. 22. and frequently elſewhere, and ſee *Beza*, in his firſt Epiſtle, applying like plaiſters to the wound of *Duditbius*.

Chillingw. alſo, more candidly than many of his followers, in his new Socinian way, that all *neceſſaries*, to all manner of perſons uſing their induſtry, are *clear* in the *Holy Scriptures*, ſeems very little ſolicitous in engaging the Fathers, or other Antiquity, on his ſide, by reaſon of the evidence, in Holy Scriptures, of all *neceſſaries*; and the needleſneſs of deciding any *non-neceſſaries*. —*I for my part* [ſaith he in the latter end of his work after his declaring, not the Articles of the Church of *England*, not the harmony of Proteſtant Confeſſions; but the Bible, the Bible, to be his Religion] *after a long*, (*and as I verily believe and hope*) *impartial ſearch of the true way to eternal happineſs, do profeſs plainly, that I cannot finde any reſt for the ſole of my foot, but upon this Rock only* [*i. e.* of the Bible, not, of the Church; for as for this latter he goes on.] —*I ſee plainly, and with my own eyes; that there are Popes againſt Popes, Councils againſt Councils, ſome Fathers againſt others, the ſame Fathers againſt themſelves, a conſent of Fathers of one age againſt a conſent of Fathers of another age, the Church of one age againſt the Church of another age, Traditive Interpretations of Scripture, few or none found,—no ſufficient certainty, but of Scripture only*, [not any it ſeems of Antiquity, or of the Primitive Church: yet, out of which the Catholicks alwaies convinced Hereſies] *for any conſidering man to build upon.* Thus he, down-right. §. 309

§. 310.

And therefore it is conſiderable; That, in his anſwers to † the *Motives* of his turning *Catholick* † (that you may ſee the Authority of Antiquity, and of Church-Tradition, had a great hand in

† *See the concluſion of his Preface,* §. 41. &c.

in leading him to Popery, but none at all in reducing him to Proteſtantiſme) he is not ſollicitous at all to deny, or diſprove, the truth of theſe *motives*; but, to traverſe the conſequence he formerly made from them. So, to the firſt Motive to the Roman Catholick Religion: *viz.* —*That a perpetual viſible Profeſſion is apparently wanting to Proteſtant Religion, ſo far as concerns the points in conteſtation.* He anſwers, not, by denying any ſuch viſible profeſſion to be wanting to Proteſtants; But, that any ſuch viſible Profeſſion, without any mixture of falſhood, is not neceſſary. Again, to the Fourth: —*That many Points of Proteſtant Doctrine are the opinions of Hereticks, condemned by the Primitive Church* He anſwers, not, by denying the Proteſtant Doctrines to be condemned as Heretical, by the Primitive Church; But, that thoſe in the Primitive Church condemned many doctrines as ſuch; that were not ſo. To the Sixth, —*That the Doctaine of the Church of* Rome *is conformable, and the doctrine of Proteſtants contrary, to the doctrine of the Fathers, who lived in the firſt 600 years, even by the confeſſion of Proteſtants themſelves.* He Anſwers, not by denying this; but by retortion of the like to the Roman Church: —*That the Doctrine of Papiſts is confeſt by the Papiſts, contrary to the Fathers, in many points.* But here he tells not, in what points. And had he, I ſuppoſe it would either have been in ſome points not controverted with Proteſtants; As perhaps about the *Millenium: communicating of Infants*, or the like; or elſe, in ſome circumſtances, only of ſome point controverted. To the Tenth, —*That Proteſtants, by denying all humane Authority either of Pope or Councils, or Church, to determine controverſies of Faith, have aboliſhed all poſſible means of ſuppreſſing Hereſie, or reſtoring unity to the Church*: He anſwers, not, by denying Proteſtants to reject all humane Authority, Pope, Councils, or Church: But by maintaining, that Proteſtants, in having the Scriptures only, and indeavouring to believe them in the true ſence, have no need of any ſuch authority for determining matters of Faith; nor, can be Hereticks, and do take the only way for reſtoring unity. In all which, you ſee Church-authority and ancient Tradition led on the man to be Catholick; and the rejecting this authority, and betaking himſelf to a private interpretation and underſtanding of the Scriptures, and indeavouring to believe them in their true ſence, reduced him to Proteſtantiſm. He mean-while not conſidering, how any can be ſaid to uſe a *right indeavour* to believe *Scripture* in the true *ſence*; or, to ſecure himſelf from *Hereſie*; or to conſerve *unity*, * who refuſeth, herein, to obey the direction of thoſe ſpiritual Superiors,

ors, paſt, preſent, Fathers, Councils, Biſhops, whom our Lord hath appointed to guide and inſtruct his Church in the true ſence of Scriptures, as to matter of Faith, *Ut non, fluctuantes, circumferamur omni vento doctrinæ* &c. *Eph.* 4. 14. Again, * who refuſeth to continue in the *Confeſſion* of the *Faith* of theſe Guides, ſo to eſcape *Hereſies*; and, to continue in their *Communion*, ſo to enjoy the Catholick *unity*. And what *Hereſie* at all is it here that Mr. *Chillingw.* ſuppreſſeth? which none can incur, that is verily perſwaded, that ſence, he takes Scripture in, to be the right; and what Heretick is not ſo perſwaded? For profeſſing any thing againſt ones Conſcience, or Judgment, or againſt what he thinks is the ſence of Scripture, is not *Hereſie*, bu *Hypocriſy*. And what new unity is this that Mr. *Chillingw.* entertains? that none can want, who will but admit all to his communion (whatever tenents they are of) that, to this Interrogatory, *whether they do indeavour to believe Scripture in a true ſence?* Will anſwer affirmatively. † But this is beſide my preſent purpoſe; and his Principles have been already diſcuſſed at large in *Diſc.* 2. §. 38. &c. So much of *Mr. Chillingw.*

† See *his Preface*, §. 43. *parag. To the* 10*th.*

By theſe Inſtances the diſintereſſed will eaſily diſcern, what way he is to take, if he will commit his ignorance, or diſſatisfaction in Controverſies, to the guidance of *Antiquity*, or *Church-Authority* paſt, when he ſees ſo many of the Reformed in the beginning, but alſo ſeveral of late, deſerting as it were their Title to it (excepting the times Apoſtolical) as not defendable.

§. 311.

§. Lſtly, In all this he will be the more confirm'd, when he obſerves, that theſe men, inſtead of imbracing, and ſubmitting to, the Doctrines and Traditions of former Church-Doctrine, fly, in the laſt place, to that deſperat ſhift of the early appearance of *Antichriſt* in the world; who alſo (as they ſay) muſt needs be comprehended within the Body of the Church, and be a profeſſor of Chriſtianity; nay, muſt be the very chief Guides, and Patriarchs thereof; and theſe, as high as the Fourth, or Fifth age; nay much ſooner, (ſay ſome) even upon the *Exit* of the Apoſtles. A conceit, which, arm'd, with the Texts, 1 *Jo.* 2. 18. [little children, as ye have heard, that Antichriſt ſhall come, ſo are there even now many Antichriſts]—and *c.* 4. *v.* 3. [This is the ſpirit of Antichriſt, whereof you have heard, that it ſhould come; and even now already is it in the world,] arm'd, I ſay, with theſe Texts miſapplied to the perſons, whom they think fit to diſcredit, at one blow cuts off the Head of all *Church-Authority*, *Tradition*, *Fathers*, *Councils*, how ancient ſoever: And the main Artifice this was, whereby *Luther* made his new Doctrine

to

to ſpread abroad and take root; when he had, thus, firſt taken away all reverence to former Church, and its conſtant Doctrines and Traditions, as this Church having been, for ſo long a time, the very *ſeat of Antichriſt*, *Babylon*, *the great Whore*, and I know not what. And after this *ground-work* laid; now, ſo much in Antiquity as any Proteſtant diſlikes, preſently appears to him under the ſhape of Antichriſtian Apoſtacy: and in his reſiſting, and oppoſing the Church, he quiets his conſcience herewith; and ſeems to himſelf, not a Rebel againſt his ſpiritual Governours, but a Champion againſt Antichriſt. But on theſe terms, if they would well conſider it, our Lords promiſes to the Church, that it ſhould be ſo firmly built on the Rock, as that the Gates of Hell ſhould never prevail againſt it, and the Apoſtles Prediction, that it ſhould alwaies be a Pillar and ground of Truth, are utterly defeated, and have miſcarried, in its very infancy. For how can theſe Gates of Hell more prevail, than, that the chief Guides and Governours of this Church, ſignified by the falſe Prophet, *Apoc.* 13. 11. &c. with great *ſignes* and *miracles*, ſhall ſet up *Satans Kingdom* and Standard in the *midſt* of it, ſhall practice a manifold *Idolatry within* it; and corrupt the *Nations* with their falſe Doctrines; and laſtly, maintain this kingdom of Satan (thus ſet up, I ſay, not without, or againſt, but within the bowels of, the Church) now, by the ordinary computation of Proteſtants, for above Twelve hundred years; whilſt the *Emperor*, and other *Roman Catholick Princes* are imagined during all this time to be the *Beaſt*, or Secular State, *that opens its mouth in Blaſphemy againſt God*; and *makes war with the Saints*.† To whoſe Religion this falſe Prophet gives life, *Apoc.* 13. 11, 15. Both which, this *Beaſt* and this *Falſe-Prophet*, for their Idolatry and Oppreſſion, at the appointed time (before this expected; now, they ſay, not far off;) ſhall be caſt into the *Lake* or poole of *Fire*. For ſo their doom runs, *Apoc.* 19, 20.—*And the Beaſt was taken and the Falſe Prophet,—and both theſe were caſt alive into a lake of fire.*

† *Apoc.* 13. 6, 7.

§. 312. And this, ſo great, and miſchievous, an error, becomes in them much the leſs excuſable, ſince the latter world hath ſeen the appearance of the great *Falſe Prophet Mahomet* upon the ſtage: and ſince they might eaſily diſcern, all the phenomena, or Characters of the *Apocalyptical falſe Prophet*, which are by them, through inſuperable difficulties, miſapplied to the Pope, the Head of the Church, to have been moſt viſibly and eminently fulfilled in Him.

* Who is the head and Founder of that *falſe Religion*, which hath ſo boldly invaded Chriſtianity, after ſo many hundred years growth;

growth; and ſupplanted it in the greateſt and moſt dignified part of the converted world. * Whoſe *ſigns* and *wonders*, how lying or ridiculous ſoever (for God forbid, any ſuch ſhould be expected from this falſe Prophet, as our Lord, or his Apoſtles did) have had the very ſame effect, as the two Apoſtles † have foretold thoſe of the *falſe Prophet* ſhould have, *viz.* the *ſeduction*, and deluſion of the *Nations*; and if there be no wonder in the *wonders*, the greater wonder there is in the *ſeduction*, that followed upon them. * Who hath introduced a new Goſpel, and that pretended to have been written in heaven, he aſſuming therein the perſon and voice of God; new Sacraments; new daies, and places, of ſolemn worſhip; who hath moulded a new, fine, eaſie religion, void (as he ſaith) of all *Controverſies* and ſubtilties; and conſiſting only of one Article of Faith [*One only God and* Mahomet *his Prophet.*] Deviſed new pleaſing laws, which (that they might be point-blanck oppoſit to our Lords) are full of luſt and uncleanneſs on one ſide, and of cruelty, rapin, tyranny, violence, the ſword, ſlavery, and the law martial, on another: and hath invented new future ſenſual--Beatitudes ſuitable to the obſervance of his laws. * Who hath changed *Dies Dominica*, for ſolemn worſhip, into *Dies Veneris*; and the viſiting of our Lords Sepulchre and Temple at *Jeruſalem*, to his at *Mecha*; Subjecting *Sarah* to *Hagar*, and *Iſaac* to *Iſmael*. * Who hath taken away the Chriſtian Altars, and the daily Evangelical Sacrifice, the Sacraments, the Prieſts, and thrown out of the Churches the Bodies of the Saints, interred there, as contaminating them.

† *Apocal.* 13. 13, 14. — 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 9, 10.

* Who, after the attempts of *Cerinthus*, *Carpocrates*, and others in S. *Johns* daies, and the progreſs of *Arius*, and his Diſciples, in following ages (almoſt all the ancient Hereticks being treacherous to our Lords Divinity) hath at laſt compleated that which is ſpoken of 1 *Joh.* 4. 2. * the *Diſſolution of Jeſus* [as the vulgar, and thoſe Greek Copies it follows, have it; ὁ καταλύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν, †]or * the denial of *Jeſus* his coming *in the fleſh* (as other Copies) *i. e.* his *deſcending* from Heaven *into* the *fleſh*; whilſt he hath rob'd our Lord not only of his *Divinity*, but alſo, by this, of the High Prerogatives of his *Humanity* too; rob'd him alſo of his *Croſs* and *Death* (which he ſaith he never ſuffered) and ſo rob'd Him and the world of his *Satisfactions* and *Merits*; and all the vertue of the Sacraments relating thereto; and hath challenged the Honour, of being the *laſt Prophet*, ſent from God, unto himſelf. * In whom the *Dragon* ſeems to have ſhewed his *greateſt*, and *laſt*, Art; (after the world was ſomewhat well acquainted with his former ſnares.) For, whereas heretofore he thruſt all

§. 313.

† See *Socrat. Hiſt. l.* 7, c. 32. — *Irenaus*, *l.* 3. c. 18.

Apoc. 13. 2.

all the world into *Idolatry*, now, out of the envy which Satan bears to the *Honour* given by the Church to the glorified *Saints*, his Diſciple and Champion, this *falſe Prophet*, becomes *a profeſſed enemy* to all former *Idolatry*; and much diſpleaſed he is with Chriſtianity upon this account. And again, out of the envy Satan bears to the *Divinity* of our Lord, a great zealot this his *falſe Prophet* is for the worſhip of *one only God*; that (ſaith he) hath neither *wife*, nor *child*. Yet who, in oppoſing and denying the Divinity of our Lord *Jeſus*, the *Son*, hath loſt, and depriv'd himſelf of, *God the Father* too, in St. *Johns* conſequence; For, 1 *Jo*. 2. 23.—*He who denieth the Son* [*i. e.* that Jeſus is the Son; or (*ver*. 22.) *that Jeſus is the Chriſt*, or, 1 *Jo*. 4. 3.—*that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh* [*i. e.* come from heaven, or from God, into the *fleſh*, all which this falſe Prophet expreſly oppoſeth;] *He that*, thus, *denies the Son, the ſame* [alſo] *hath not the Father*, ſaith the Apoſtle. And ſo this *man of ſin* retaines no title either to *God* the *Son*, or *God* the *Father*; either to the God of *Chriſtians*, or to the *Heathen* God's; whom alſo he hath caſt off.

§. 314. * Who hath planted himſelf in all the primitively famous Churches to whom our Lord or his Apoſtles directed their Epiſtles (except one, where the woman cloth'd with the Sun hath hitherto had a place provided for her) and, amongſt others, in God's Temple at *Jeruſalem*; from the poſſeſſion of which no Chriſtian Heroical attempts have been able hitherto, finally to expell him. * Who, poſſeſſing all the middle of the earth, and having thruſt up the Church as it were into a corner, and the outer-skirts, thereof, the Iſlands of the Weſt, hath erected a new dreadful Empire; and reviv'd the *Image* of the former Heathen State, that perſecuted the Church in the beginning, and which long ſince ſeemed to have received its mortal wound; which he hath wonderfully cured: And ſeated this his Empire in the very ſame place, and turned the St. *Sophia*, heretofore the glory of Chriſtian Churches, into a Moſche.* Whoſe miraculous conqueſts have made the world to wonder after him, and to Adore him, ſaying, who is like to him? who, able to make war with him? *Apoc*. 13. 3, 4. * With whoſe perſecution no former can be compar'd either for duration of time, or (by his facile, and ſenſual, Religion) ſlaughter of ſouls. * Who alſo hath afflicted Chriſtianity now for above a 1000 of the Proteſtants 12 hundred and ſixty Daies‖ taken for years: & near upon the ſame time (that they may ſee the numbers alſo fit Him) as, they ſay, the Pope hath oppreſſed it. [Only, the Antiquity of the Churches *pretended* Idolatry, ſaid to be about, or before, *A. D.* 400.† forceth them to begin their account

Apoc. 12. 6, 14. 2 *Theſſ* 2. 4.
Apoc. 13. 3. 12, 13.
Apoc. 13. 3, 4.
‖ *Apoc*. 12, 6. 14.--13. 5.--11. 3.
Dan. 7. 25. --12. 7.
† *Mede Apoſtacy of latter times*, c. 14.--Dr. *More Synops Prophet*, c. 7. n 7.--*Apolog*. p. 552.

account of the *Popes Apoſtacy*, and oppreſſion of the Faith, ſo early, as, juſtly computed, it happens to be already expired. Yet expired, without any alteration of affairs obſerved at this time, correſpondent to the Prophecy (for that change at the *Reformation*, (a great one indeed) on the other ſide, comes too early) whereas the account applied to the *Mahometan Apoſtacy*, being of 200. years later date, ſuffers as yet no contradiction from the event.]

§. 325. * Who, by all theſe things, by abrogating the Laws, and Worſhip not only of all the former *Heathen Gods*, but alſo of the *Chriſtians*, and the true, God; and, inſtead thereof, ſetting up his own, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 4. *hath oppoſed*, and *exalted himſelf above all that is called God*; and *ſhewed himſelf, as though he were God*: If we may underſtand theſe expreſſions of the *Apoſtle*, coucerning this later enemy of God, and his Church, as we do thoſe of the *Prophets* (whence they were borrowed) concerning thoſe ancient ones: The King of *Babylon*, and the King of *Tyre*, and *Antiochus Epiphanes*, of whom like things are ſpoken there. Of the King of *Babylon* thus the Prophet *Eſay* † —*Thou didſt ſay in thine heart: I will aſcend into heaven; above the Stars of God, will I exalt my throne: I will ſit in the Mount of the Teſtament* [the Temple] *I will aſcend above the height of the clouds, and be like to the Higheſt.* † c. 14. 13, 14.

Of the King of *Tyre* thus the Prophet *Ezech.* †—*Thou haſt ſaid, I am God; and have ſitten in the chair of God*, &c. and, *ver.* 6. —*Thy heart is elevated, as the heart of God.* † c. 28. 2.

And of *Antiochus* thus the Prophet *Daniel.* †—*That he ſhould elevate and magnifie himſelf againſt every God; and againſt the God of Gods ſpeak magnificent things*, —*That the God of his Fathers he ſhould not account of, neither care for any of the Gods.* † c. 11. 36, 37.

Yet, in the fulfilling of theſe Propheſies, their exaltations and blaſphemies (who ſtill had ſome Deity whom they externally profeſſed to adore,) their Empires, and Tyrannies over the Saints, are no way comparable to thoſe of the preſent *Mahometan* Empire; and this Son of *Iſmael's* preſuming to exalt himſelf above the Son of God; Chriſt our Lord, *who is over all things, God Bleſſed for ever.* || *Rom.* 9. 6. Laſtly, * who hath effected all his Projects with the greater ſucceſs, and leſs diſturbance or jealouſie of Chriſtians, becauſe one part of them, out of a particular intereſt, and inteſtine quarrels, miſapply the Propheſies to another Perſon; Another part, from the *high* expreſſions of them, (which are uſually very *Hyperbolical*) expect yet greater matters, than have been diſcovered in him, or probably ſhall be, in any other.

However, I think, He, that ſoberly weighs the things ſaid before, will ſee, what little reaſon *Proteſtants* have had to arraigne, and condemn, the *Biſhop of Rome*; the chief *Paſtor* of Chriſts Flock, for this great *falſe Prophet*; and mean while to abſolve, and diſmiſs this *Barrabas*. To whom the New Teſtament Propheſies ſeem to agree with much exactneſs, but no way to ſuit to the other.

CHAP. XVI.

Of the pretence of Certainty, againſt Church-Authority.

Reply to the 2d Defence, The pretended certainty of a Truth, againſt Church-Authority, §. 318.

1. *That it is a very difficult thing to arrive to a rational, and demonſtrative certainty, in matters intellectual; more, in matters Divine, and Spiritual; and eſpecially, in ſuch Divine matters, where Church-Authority delivers the contrary for a certain Truth*, Ibid.

Inſtances made in four principal points of modern Controverſie: For which Church-Authority is, by many Proteſtants, charged with Idolatry, and Sacriledge, §. 320.

1. *The Corporal preſence, and conſequently Adoration, of Chriſts Body and Blood in the Euchariſt*, §. 321.
2. *Invocation of Saints*, 322.
3. *Veneration of Images*, §. 323.
4. *Communion in one kind*, §. 324.

2. *That ſuch certainty, if in a Truth of ſmall importance, though it cannot yield an obedience of Aſſent to Church-Authority, yet ſtands obliged ſtill to an obedience of ſilence.* §. 330, Conceded by Proteſtants, §. 331.

3. *That ſuch Certainty of a Truth never ſo important, and neceſſary (where alſo one is to be certain, that it is ſo) though it be ſuppoſed free from the obedience, of Aſſent; and of ſilence; yet ſtands obliged to a third, a paſsive obedience, to Church-Authority, a peaceable undergoing the Churches Cenſures (though this be the heavieſt, Excommunication; and that unjuſt;) without erecting,*

ing, or joyning to any other external Communion, divided from it. Which third obedience only yielded, preſerves the Church from ſchiſme. §. 332, 333.

§. 316. I Have ſpoken hitherto of the firſt of the two Guards (mentioned before, §. 270.) which Proteſtants uſe, to defeat obedience to the *Council* of *Trent*, or any other, though proved never ſo *legal*, or *ſupreme*; *viz.* the *obligation* to follow their *Conſcience* againſt any humane Authority, even though this Conſcience be *erroneous*. To which hath been replied: That, ſuch *obligation* granted, yet there is no general ſecurity to any one in this practice; becauſe of another obligation precedent to this: namely, his duty, firſt, rightly to *inform* his *Conſcience*; ſo that, whenſoever the firſt is neglected, the latter excuſeth not. And then: For the rectifying this *information* of *Conſcience*, which requires our greateſt care, I have ſet down (§. 274, 275, 277.) the three common deceits, the intereſted Will uſeth to corrupt, or miſguide the Conſcience, or Judgment, as it pleaſeth; namely, 1. Either by hindring the Judgment from any ſearch of ſuch matters of Religion, and wholy diverting it to other imployments, whereby it may become more pliable to any impreſſion, in theſe ſpiritual matters, which ſeculat intereſt recommends: 2. Or, by indulging a ſearch into ſuch matters, but this preingaged, and confined to a *Party*: 3. Or, by admitting an impartial ſearch into all ſides: But this, only as to arguments drawn from *ſeeming Reaſon*; but not, as to thoſe other, drawn from the juſt weight of *preſent*, or *paſt*, *Church-Authority*. All which Arts and Deceits, of the Will, have been ſeriouſly reflected on, and cenſured (the firſt in, §. 281, *&c.* The ſecond, §. 289. *&c.* The third, §. 291, *&c.*) And ~~ſo~~, a well-informed Conſcience, thus will be reduced to *obedience* of *Church-Authority*, in all ſpiritual matters; at leaſt, in ſuch, or ſo many, wherein it acknowledgeth no abſolute *Certainty* of its own opinions.

§. 317. Now of the ſecond *Guard*, or Defence, (mentioned before, §. 271.) againſt *obedience* to a legal *Church-Authority*; (uſed by thoſe Proteſtants, who ſee the weak plea of a *miſinformed* conſcience, which every *groſs error* makes uſe of; and who ſeem more reſpectful, and wary, to preſerve their duty to their ſpiritual Superiors) *viz.* Where perſons have a *certainty*, that ſuch Church-Authority manifeſtly errs. Which certainty they ſay, any one may preſume of ſo often, as he can demonſtrate the contrary of what is mainteined by this *Authority*. The trial of which *Demonſtration*

tion also, whether it be a true one, they say, is thus certainly discovered, if so many others, as hear it, and understand the terms, are also satisfied and convinced by it (for such a sence against false *Demonstrations* the more judicious Protestants have made against the Puritans, and those, who have pretended manifest errors in, and so refused obedience to, their own *Provincial*, or *National Synods*.)

§. 318. In answer to this Second Defence. First: It may be noted here: That all persons *not-certain* are, by this plea, left to *Church-Obedience*. Secondly. These things, concerning *Certainty*, shall freely be granted unto them: 1. That, who is certain of any thing, neither ought, nor indeed possibly can, yield the obedience of *Assent* to any *Authority* whatever proposing the contrary; nor may profess to yield it; for this is lying, and acting against Conscience: 2. And again; That to one liable to error in some things, yet some other things may well be so plain, and manifest, that he may have abundant certainty thereof. And: 3. That such a *Demonstration* of his *Certainty*, as, proposed to any that understands the terms, satisfieth and convinceth him, is good. But, these granted, yet a Judgment, well purged from Secular Interest, will here also consider,

1. for 2. vid. p. 292 — or §. 330. 1. That it is no such easie matter, as it is thought, to arrive at *certainty* in things intellectual, where our sences do not assist us; and especially those, that are Divine, and Spiritual; * where, these things not being collected by Reason, but originally delivered to us by Divine Revelation, both the matters are, many times, very *mysterious*, treating of the perfections, wisdom, and waies, of God: His Divine Laws, and Sacraments; things above our *natural* reach; and the words also, signifying these to us, are many times not free from *several acceptions*, literal, and figurative (else all persons would agree in the same sence) so that apparent contradiction in the words, by distinguishing of some term, is none in the sence, but both the verbal Contradictories very true; * Where again, these Revelations being many, and all most certainly true, none may be taken in such a sence, as to contradict *any* other; And lastly, * where, the true *essence* of things, abstracted from all their *Accidents* (which accidents again cannot be known to us to be so, but by an *actual separation*) being not perfectly known to us, hence also though it be most certain to us that two contradictories cannot be true, yet is it most difficult to discern, what things truly contradict. For it is a Contradiction only, when the same thing is denied of, or removed from, its self. As this

this [a man is not a man.] Or this [A man is white, and not white] where the formal Contradiction, being reſolv'd, is [whiteneſs is not whiteneſs: Manhood is not Manhood.] And it is no contradiction, but truth, when ever a thing is denied of any thing not it ſelf. Therefore this, what is, or is not, the thing it ſelf; or, its eſſence; muſt exactly be known, before a true and reall contradiction be ſo. And this difficulty, which is indeed in all nature, muſt ſtill be the greater in theſe things *ſpiritual*, and more remote from ſence; of which we are ſpeaking. — *Cum res tanta ſit* (ſaith St. *Auſtin* †) *ut Deus tibi ratione cognoſcendus ſit, omneſne putas idoneos*, &c. And, *Tu in eos libros, qui ſancti, Divinarumq; rerum pleni, &c, ſine Duce irruis?* And, — *Nihil eſt facilius, quam, non ſalum ſe diſcere, ſed etiam opinari, verum inveniſſe; ſed hoc ipſa difficillimum eſt.* And therefore, in that excellent Treatiſe, † he adviſeth them firſt, laying aſide ſuch fancies of certainty to believe the Church. — *Quo illuminaturo præparentur Deo.*] And, indeed, who is there, if he reflect upon the many ſeeming certainties, that he hath had in ſome opinions, afterward forſaken, that will not perceive, that this conceited certainty is an ordinary fallacy, which thoſe, who know leaſt, and ſo have leaſt reaſon to think themſelves certain are moſt ſubject to. — *Qui ad pauca reſpicit, facile pronunciat.*

† *See before,* §. 293.

† *De utilitate Credendi.*

But then further: If in thoſe things Divine, this particular point, wherein we pretend a certainty, be ſuch, as that the ſupremeſt Church-Authority, propoſeth to us the contrary as certain; an Authority, (not to mention here the ſupernatural aſſiſtance promiſed them) of the ſame, or better abilities, than we, for their Intellectuals; and that hath all the ſame external means, and Grounds, of the knowledge of ſuch point as we, perhaps more; to whom alſo all the Grounds, Motives, Arguments of our certainty of it have been communicated; perſons likewiſe (we ought to preſume) of as much diligence in ſearching truth, as much integrity, and freedom from paſſion, and intereſt, as our ſelves; For theſe judge for *themſelves* as well as for their *Subjects*; and ſet down their own, as well as preſcribe anothers, *faith*; this, I ſay, will make any ſuch conceited *certainty* on our ſide yet much more irrational: (See more ſaid of this in the 4th. *Diſc.* §. 11.) And laſtly, beſides all this, our pretended *Demonſtrations*, being put to the trial according to the former Proteſtant-Definition of a *demonſtration*, will prove conſtantly falſe, as from which ſo many rational and learned perſons, hearing or reading

§. 319.

reading them, continue to dissent. Neither here will the plea, of the *perspicuity* and clearness of the *Scriptures* in such point, (ordinarily the chief pretence we have for our certainty) any way relieve us, or release our *obedience* to these *Governours*, but rather promote it. Because, if these Scriptures to us clear, so will they be to them: Or, if these Scriptures, like the Israelites Cloud, be light to one, and darkness to another, our humility ought to believe, that the light side of it will be rather toward the Church-Governours, than toward us, when singular, and differing from them; who also are appointed ‖ to enlighten us. ‖

‖ *Mat.* 5. 14.

§. 320. The four main points, that are maintained by the supreme Church-Authority, to which Protestants refuse conformity, and at which they take most offence, and many of them charge the Church of *Rome* with *Idolatry* and *Sacriledge*; are, 1. The *corporal* presence of Christs *Body* and *Blood* in the *Eucharist*, and consequently *Adoration* of them, as present. 2. *Worship and Invocation of Saints.* 3. *Veneration of Images*; 4. *Communion in one kind.* As for a *fifth*, which might be added: The *language*, that ought to be used, according to several Nations, in the Celebration of the *publick Service* of God, I here omit it: Supposing this might be easily so accomodated, as, *solely*, to be no hinderance of an *union*; where all the other real Controversies are accorded between the two Churches.

§. 321. For the First, then, of these four points, *the corporal presence of our Lord in the Eucharist*, from which follows *Adoration*: Since, as hath been shewed in the first Discourse, §. 62, and more copiously in the Historical *Disc.* of the Eucharist. §. 35. a possibility thereof is not opposed by many of the Reformed; and the *true sense* of *Hoc est Corpus meum*, and of other *Scriptures*, whether *de facto*, these do declare it so present, is that, by which this Question, between the two Parties must be decided; I see not what *Demonstrative certainty*, any Protestant can rationally pretend, of the sense he gives to these Scriptures, in opposition to that other sence of them, which is maintained by *Church-Authority*; and hath been, by so many Councils, expressly declared, (long before Protestancy thought on; ✠ Of which Councils, see 1 *Disc.* §. 57. &c) and this, after so long, and subtile disputes for about three hundred years; *viz.* from the 2*d. Nicen* Council to the daies of *Berengarius*; and after so diligent an Examination

nation (on all sides) of *Primitive Tradition*, by *Paschasius*, *Bertram*, and others, Eight hundred years ago; and, since that, by *Lanfrank*, *Guitmund*, &c. at the appearance of *Berengarius*. Which *Primitive Tradition*, and judgement of *Antiquity*, that it was, ~~(if this may not be taken on the credit of so many Councils,)~~ the same concerning these Scriptures, with that of the *present* Church Authority, I think any one, that is well affected to the peace of the Church, and not pre-ingaged in Disputes, will receive sufficient satisfaction, ~~herein;~~ who will at his leisure spend a few hours in a publick Library to read, entire, and not by cited parcels, the short Discourses, on this subject, of * St. *Ambrose*, *De Myster. initiand.* chap. 9. — * *The Author of the Books*, De Sacramentis [ascribed to the same Father] *l.* 4. the 4, and 5. *Chapters.* * *Cyrill. Hierosol. Catechis. Mystagog.* 4. and 5. * *Chrysostom, in Matt. Homil.* 83. — *In. Act. Apost. Hom.* 21. — *In*, 1 *Cor. Hom.* 24. * *Greg. Nyssen, Orat. Catechet. c.* 36, 37. * *Euseb. Emissen.* or *Cæsarius Arelatens. De Paschate Serm.* 5. * *Hilarius Pictao. De Trinitate*, the former part of the *eighth* book. * *Cyril. Alexand. In Evangel. Johan. l.* 10. *c.* 13. Concerning the Authenticalness of several of which pieces (for the last Protestant refuge is to pronounce them *spurious*) you may remember the forecited passage of *Casaubon* † speaking of such a subterfuge of *Du Moulins*, — *Falsus illi Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, falsus Gr. Nyssenus; falsus Ambrosius, falsi omnes; mihi liquet, falli ipsum* [Molinæum.]

(If this may not be taken on ye Credit of so many Councils, yet) I think &c.

† §. 307.

Not, that I affirm here, that every one, that reads these pieces, shall be so perswaded, and convinced. For, as hath been shewed, the *Interests* of the *Will* have a strange power of disguising, and miscolouring, things to the *understanding*. As, when, perhaps, the pre-design of making a *Reply* to an *Adversary*, is the reason of ones reading of such a piece of a Father; and when one hath, first, stated the *Question* to himself, ordered his Arguments, deduced his Conclusions, solved Objections, *&c.* and then, upon such provocation of an Antagonist, is brought to examine their writings; here we may presume, such a one will be very loath now to pull down the whole Fabrick he hath built before, and to lay down his Arms: and that it will go hard, if he cannot find something in them seeming favourable to his cause. Either, 1. for the *Terms* used by the *Father*; he will contend, that they are to be taken according to the mode of those times, and not in a proper, or modern, sense: ~~On~~ That their *Rhetorick*, and *Eloquence*, fitted, not to state the *Question*, or inform the Judgement, but to move Affections, and gain

§. 274. &c.

ss. v. p. 287.

Then

the Will, doth often make uſe of ſuch expreſſions, as, rigourouſly taken, *tranſcend* the *Truth*. Or, [1]. For the *ſenſe* given, when apparently againſt him; he will propoſe ſome ſeeming-irrational conſequences and abſurdities, that follow from it; or, ſome other Tenents of the Father, that will not conſiſt with it; and the *Tranſlation* alſo; or the Copy, ſhall many times be blamed. Or, [2]. Touching the *Diſcourſe*; He will either pronounce the *whole* illegitimate and ſpurious, as pretended to be found of a different ſtile from the *Father's* other works: or, ſome words uſed in it, ſome Rites, or Cuſtoms mentioned, that are of a later date or age; or, ſuch work not found in ſuch Editions; or, not mentioned by later writers: or, that it is *in part* corrupted and interpolated; and, not all of a piece. [3] Or at leaſt, He will find ſome *Clauſes*, in the ſame, or in ſome other, diſcourſe of the *Father*, whereby he may ſeem to *confeſs* in one place, what he *denies* in another: or, which may ſerve at leaſt to render him ſomewhat *confuſed* and *obſcure* in the Point, and ſo, ſerviceable to no Party. I name theſe defences not ſo, but that ſometimes they may be true, but, that they are much oftner made uſe of, than there is any juſt cauſe; and, are apt to blind the unwary, and preoccupated, and ſuch, as have the infelicity to be engaged againſt Truth, before they are well read in Antiquity.

n. p. 287.

n. p. 293.

§. 321. n. 2. So the late Cenſurer of Dr. *Arnaulds* laſt Book concerning the *Euchariſt*, *Vigier*, after the two former Combatants, *Arnauld*, and *Claude*, one by taking the Fathers in a plain, and literal, the other, in a Metaphorical ſenſe, had each of them challenged Antiquity, as clearly on his own ſide, ſeeks to diſpatch the *Controverſie*, much what like the *Woman* in the Book of *Kings* †, whoſe the childe was not.—*Nec mihi, nec Tibi ſit.* Saying ||—*That the true belief of the ancient Church, about this point of the Euchariſt, is very hard to be known; That there are innumerable perplexities in it; and that, if the Fathers have believed the Reality, as he ſeeth no reaſon to doubt, but they did, they believed it in ſuch a manner, which neither Roman Catholicks, nor Proteſtants, nor any other Chriſtian Society, would approve of.* And ſo, *p.66, &c.* That the former *Greek* Church may not be found *Tranſubſtantialiſts*, he is content, they ſhould be *Stercoraniſts*; (i.e. holding I know not, what panified corruptible corporal preſence of our Lord, much more groſs, and incredible, than that of *Tranſubſtantiation*) For, whether the *Greeks* fall ſhort of, or go beyond, the *Latine* Church herein, he thinks all to his purpoſe, ſo they be not juſt the ſame. But then, over-born with Dr. *Arnaulds* modern teſtimonies, manifeſting the unanimous accord herein

† 3 *Reg.* 3. 27.

|| *Eng. Tranſlat.* p. 80.

of

of the preſent Oriental, with the Weſtern, Churches, here he will have them, to have taken up this their opinion of late from *Travellers*, but by no means to have derived it from their *Fore-fathers*, —*There may have happened* (ſaith he ||) *a change, ſince the eſtabliſhing of the Doctrine of* Tranſubſtantiation *in the* Latine *Church, either by the mixture and commerce of the* Latines *and* Greeks, *or by the Voyages of the* Portugais, *and other Nations, into the Oriental Churches*;—Mean while, the preſent *Oriental* Churches thus conſenting with the *Roman*, it may well be conſidered, what would become of the *Proteſtant* cauſe, if the Controverſie ſhould now be referred to the Deciſion of a lawful *General* Council. || p. 94.

Muchwhat the ſame courſe takes *Monſieur Claude* in his laſt *Reply* to Dr. *Arnauld*. For the ſhewing of which a little more at large, becauſe I am ſpeaking here of the *Euchariſt*, and what I ſhall ſay, may ſerve for a *pre-advertiſement* to ſome, leſs experienced in this Controverſie, that may light on his Book, and are in danger of receiving ſome impreſſions from it, prejudicial to the *Catholick* Faith; I beg leave of the Reader to make a ſtep, though ſomewhat out of my way, yet not much beſide my purpoſe; Remitting thoſe, who think this *Forreign Author* leſs concerns them, to the proſecution of the former *Diſcourſe*, reſum'd below §. 321. n. 27. §. 321. n. 3.

1ſt. This Author buſyes himſelf || to accumulate many *Teſtimonies* concerning the miſerable *ignorance*, and decay of Learning, in the *modern Greek*, and other *Oriental*, Churches, as alſo that of the *Moſcovites* ||, even amongſt their *Monaſticks*, *Prieſts*, and *Biſhops*; which induſtrious diſparaging of their Science ſhews, he hath no mind to ſtand to their Judgement. He relates their many Superſtitious and ridiculous Rites, and Ceremonies in Religion; their extreme *Poverty*; and ſo, how eaſily they are to be gained to ſay, or do, any thing, with the Money, or, (to ſpeak it in better Language,) with the Charities, which the *Latines* frequently beſtow on them. Hence theſe Nations being ſo *ignorant*, their ſentiments in Religion are leſs to be valued. || l. 2. c. 1. || l. 5. c. 1.

2. He proceeds || to tell us the many opportunities, the *Latines* have had, of introducing *Innovations*, and propagating the *Roman Faith* in thoſe Countreys; 1. By ſo many Weſtern *Armies* that have paſſed thither, for the Conqueſt of the Holy Land; and have ſettled there, to maintain their Victories; and ſo kept the Orientals in Subjection for near 200 years; §. 321. n. 4. || l. 2. c. 2. & c.

2. By the *inability* of the later *Grecian Emperours* to defend their Dominions; and so, their often endeavouring to accommodate *Religion* after the best way for their Secular advantages; and that was, by a *Conformity* in it with the *West*; 3. By the continual *Missions* of *Priests*, and *Religious* of all Orders, (each of them striving to have some plantation in the East;) especially, the *Missions* of *Jesuites*, thither; who by their manifold diligence, in instructing their children, educating their youth, distributing many charities to the necessitous, playing the Physitians, teaching the Mathematicks, *&c.* insinuate also into them their Religion, having corrupted also several of their Bishops. Hence we may imagine, these *Missions* of the *Latines* having thus overspread the whole face of the East, and practising so many Acts to change its Faith, it will seem a hard task to prove, concerning any particular *Testimony* procured from thence, that the persons subscribing it are no way *Latiniz'd*, no way tainted in their judgement; and, that they are not already circumvented, and won over in some Points, though perhaps they may still stand out in some others. "[All this He doth, to shew the great industry of these *Missions* to *pervert* the Truth there: But, indeed, manifests their indefatigable zeal and courage, through infinite hazards, to *advance* it: negociating the Conversion of *Infidels*, as well as the instruction of *ignorant Christians*: And *Roman Catholicks* are much indebted to M. *Claude* for his great pains, in giving so exact an account of their *Piety*.]

§. 321. n. 5. 3. Having premised such a Narration as this, to be made use of, as he sees fit, for invalidating the Testimonies of the modern *Greeks*. 3ly. He declares, that he doth not undertake at all to shew, that the *Greeks* concur with *Protestants* in their Opinion concerning our *Lords presence* in the *Eucharist*; and much complains of his *Adversary*, for imposing such an attempt upon him. L. 3. c. 1. — *It is not our business here* (saith he) *to shew; whether the* Greeks *have the same Faith which we* [Protestants] *have, on the subject of the Holy Sacraments: This is a perpetual Illusion that M.* Arnauld *puts upon his Readers; but, whether the* Greeks *believe of the Sacrament that, which the Church of* Rome *believes.* And l. 3. c. 13. He saith, — *He would have none imagine, that he pretends no difference between the Opinion of the* Greeks, *and* Protestants: *and he thinks that none of the* Protestant Doctors *have pretended it.* And, *Ibid.* after his stating of the *Greek* Opinion, To the censure, that he makes it *peu raisonnable*; he

he ſaith * *That to this he hath nothing to anſwer; ſave, that Pro-* * p. 336.
teſtants are not obliged to defend the Sentiment of the Greeks: // vid. infr. p. 283.
and, that his buſineſs is to enquire what it is; not, how maintainable. And ſaith elſewhere, *That both the* Greeks *and* Latines p. 337.
are far departed from the Evangelical ſimplicity, and the main and natural explication, the Ancients have given to the Myſtery of the Euchariſt.

Here then; 1ſt. as to the later ages of the Church, *Proteſtants* ſtand by themſelves; and the Reformation was made, as *Calvin* confeſſed it, † *à toto mundo*. 2. After ſuch a Confeſſion, M. *Claude* ſeems not to deal ſincerely, in that, with force enough, he draws ſo frequently in both his *Replies*, the ſayings of the *Greek* writers of later times, to the *Proteſtant* ſenſe; and puts his Adverſary to the trouble of confuting him; 2. And, from the many abſurdities, that he pretends would follow upon the *Greek* Opinion, taken according to their plain expreſſions, ſaith; theſe intend only, * a Preſence of Chriſts Body in the *Euchariſt*, as to its *Vertue* and *Efficacy*, oppoſite to its *Reality* and *Subſtance*; and * an *Union* of the Bread there to the *Divinity* only ſo far, as the Divinity to beſtow on it the *Salvifical Virtue* or *Efficacy* of Chriſts Body: and * a conjunction of the Bread, there, to Chriſts natural Body, born of the Bleſſed Virgin, but to it, as in *Heaven*, not *here*; to it, as a *Myſtery may be ſaid to be an Appendix, or Acceſſory, to the thing, of which it is a Myſtery.* But all this is the *Proteſtant Opinion*. 3. Again, ſeems not to deal ſincerely, in that, whilſt he affirms the *modern Greeks* to retain the former Doctrine of their Church as high as *Damaſcen*, and the 2. Council of *Nice* ||, and again, † *Damaſcen* not to have been the firſt, that had ſuch thoughts, (*viz.* of an Augmentation of Chriſts Body in the *Euchariſt* by the Sanctifyed Elements; as it was augmented, when he here on earth, by his nouriſhment,) but to have borrowed them from ſome Ancient *Greek Fathers*; naming *Greg. Nyſſen. Orat. Catechet.* c. 37. (See this Fathers words below §. 321. n. 14.) and *Anaſtaſius Sinait.* who explained their Doctrine by the ſame comparition, as *Damaſcen.* and the *Greeks* following him, did; yet doth not freely declare both theſe, the Ancient *Greeks*, as well as the later, either to *differ from*, or to *agree with*, the *Proteſtant* Opinion.

† *Epiſt. P. Melancthoni.*

// v. infr. p. 282.

// v. infr. p. 298.

|| *l.* 3 *c.* 13 *p.* 315.

† *l.* 3 *c.* 13 *p.* 326. — & *l.* 4 *c.* 9 *p.* 488.

// infr. p. 301.

// infr. p. 300.

4. Having ſaid this: That, however the *Greek* Opinion varies from the *Proteſtants*, it concerns him not: Next, he declares: That what ever the *Greeks* may be proved to have held, concerning ſome tranſmutation of the Bread, and Wine into Chriſts §. 321. n. 6.

Body and Blood; or, concerning a *Real*, or *Corporal presence*, and their understanding, *Hoc est corpus meum*, in a *literal* sense, neither doth this concern his cause: who undertakes only to maintain, that these Churches assert not *Transubstantiation*: at least, assert it not so, as to make it a *positive Article* of their Faith. 1. His words (upon D. *Arnaud*'s resenting it; *That whereas he contented himself only to shew, that the Real presence was received by the Oriental Schismatical Churches, M. Claude diverted the Controversie to Transubstantiation*, His words I say) are these. * *In the Dispute concerning the* Greeks, *our business is only about Transubstantiation; and not at all, about Real presence. For it was to this only, and Adoration, that I formally limited my self in my last Answer.* But then; as if this might do him some prejudice, he, as it were cautiously, addeth: — *Yet I would have none draw a Consequence from hence, that I acknowledge a Real presence established in the* Greek Church, [But here to make his words true, he adds again,] *in that sense, as the* Roman Church *understands it.* And, what sense is that? surely, by the *way* of *Transubstantiation.* And so, you see, he pares his words, till they say no more, than just what he said before: That he acknowledgeth no *Real presence*, (*viz.*) by way of *Transubstantiation*, established in the *Greek Church.* And, this is to say only; that he acknowledgeth them not to hold *Transubstantiation.* 2. Next; concerning the *Greeks* their receiving, or opposing *Transubstantiation*, he hath one Hold more, *Ibid.* — *It is not* (saith he) *our business, to know, whether the* Greeks *formally reject* Transubstantiation; *Or, whether they have made* It *an Article of Controversy between them and the* Latines; *but only, whether they comprehend it amongst their points of Faith, or no: Our Dispute is only concerning this matter.* One would think, that he had been chaced very much, and driven up to the wall, that to preserve himself safe, he makes so many outworks; and contracts the Subject of his Disputation within so narrow a Compass. But doth he not here, for the *Greek Church* also, thus decline, and tacitly as it were yield up that to the *Catholicks*, which they have always professed to be the main Controversie with *Protestants* on this Subject, (*viz.*) The *Real* and *Corporal presence* of our *Lord*; and the *perpetuity* of the Christian *Faith*, as well *East* as *West*, in the constant Belief of this, for all the later times of the *Church Catholick*; which consent found in the *later* times, is the truest proof, from which we may collect also the *true sense* of the *former*? And, from this *Corporal presence* once established, whether a *Transubstantiation*

* *l.* 3. *c.* 1. *p.* 157.

substantiation be, or be not, necessarily follows also the *lawfulness* of a *Soveraign Adoration*: which renders the Dispute concerning one of the two Points he contesteth needless; and decideth it against him: since, an Adoration of the Mysteries practised among the *Greeks* he is content to allow, but not, Soveraign; Now *Real presence* makes it out a *Soveraign* one.

5. His way thus far made; and his cause pretended not to be concerned, in that the *Greeks* have a *different* Sentiment of the Eucharist from *Protestants*; Nor, that they take, *Hoc est corpus meum*, as also the *Latines*, in a literal sense, and hold a *Real presence*: Nor, that they do not *reject* the *Roman* Transubstantiation; Or make any Controversie with the *Latines* about it: And, so all Authorities, save those that press Transubstantiation, being removed from giving him any trouble: Next; For the *Greeks* asserting a Transubstantiation, the alledging such *Testimonies* as these which follow, and frequently occur in their Authors, will not be admitted by him as good, or to the purpose.—*That, by the Consecration, the Bread is changed, and converted into the very, the proper, the True, (or, in* veritate, in reipsa,) *Body of Christ, which Body also is the same with that born of the Blessed Virgin. and that suffered on the Cross.* —*That the Eucharist is not a Figure, or Image only, of this Body, but the very Body of our Lord, united to his Divinity, as the Body born of the Blessed Virgin was; Neither are these now two, but one.* —Unum corpus, & unus Sanguis cum eo, quod sumpsit in utero Virginis; &, quod dedit Apostolis. *And*—Calix, quem Sacerdos sacrificat, non est alius, nisi ipse, quem Dominus Apostolis tradidit.—*That the Bread, that is offered in the Mysteries, is the very same Flesh of Jesus Christ, that was Sacrificed at the time of his Passion, and buryed in the Sepulchre, and which St.* Thomas *handled, and which is at the Right Hand of the Father.* —*That, after the Consecration, Though it appears Bread, yet, in verity, it is the Body of Christ.* Or,—Licet Panis nobis videatur, revera Caro est. Or,—Non manet Panis; sed pro Pane factum est Corpus Christi. I say, such expressions as these (very usual in the *Greeks*,) are not current with him for proving a Substantial change of the Bread; Or, That the Substance of it, after Consecration, doth not still remain so entire as before. For, as for *Ipsum, proprium, verum*, &c. he can produce places in the Fathers, where they are applyed to a *Metaphor*; where the *Poor*, the *Faithful*, the *Church*, are said to be *Ipsum*,

§. 321. n. 7.

ll. v. p. 281. 288.

Ipſum, or *Verum*, *Corpus Chriſti*. *The Bread is changed into the Body of Chriſt* [i. e. ſaith he, not in *Subſtance*, but in *Vertue*.] *The Euchariſt is not a Figure, or Image of the Body* [i. e. without all *Vertue* or *Efficacy*,] *but the very Body it ſelf*: [i. e. in being ſuch an *Image*, or *Figure*, as retains the ſupernatural *Vertue* of it.] But, ſtill I ſay; This *Supernatural Vertue* is not the *Body*. And, if the *Greek's* arguing from our Lords *Dixit Hoc eſt Corpus meum* be good, *viz.* That what-ever is not our Lords Body, the Euchariſt is not it; It holds as well againſt *Virtus*, if taken excluſively to Subſtance, (for ſuch Subſtance is [Body] here, or elſe, why not *Imago* a Body?) as againſt *Imago*, or *Figura*; as well againſt *Imago cum Efficacia*, as *ſine*, &c. For—*Non dixit, Hoc eſt Virtus*, or *continens virtutem Corporis mei*, but *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*. And, this being urged by his *Adverſary*, the beſt anſwer that I ſee M. *Claude* makes to it † is; *That the Proteſtanes are no engagers for the verity of the* Greek's *Opinions*. *i. e.* He impoſeth ſuch a ſenſe on the *Greeks*, as makes a Contradiction in their Opinion, or arguing; and then leaves them to make it good. Again: *Though it appears Bread, it is truly Fleſh*: [*i. e.* ſaith he; The *Greeks* hold it indeed ſtill Bread in Subſtance, and not Fleſh at all: But they mean here; that, though it appears or ſeems, yet *it is not*, [ſimple] *Bread: but it is truly Fleſh* [in as much as it now hath the true *Vertue* of *Chriſts Fleſh*:] making them ſay, *It is*, in truth, that, which yet they hold it is not; ſave only in *Vertue*, or *Efficacy*: And again; that it only *appears* that, which yet they hold, that in *Subſtance*, and, in truth, it is. And, to render this his Expoſition more current, in his 2. Anſwer, he ſaith, — *We muſt not preſs too much ſuch manner of expreſſions as theſe*, licet appareat Panis, tamen in veritate Corpus Chriſti eſt, *leſt we make the Fathers ſpeak many abſurdities*; And ſo urgeth a place in S. *Chryſoſtom*, where the Father ſaith, —*That we ought not to think of our ſelves, that are upon the Earth; becauſe we ſee the Earth under our feet: for we are tranſlated into Heaven, and placed among the Angels.* Where, ſaith he, the Father denies not abſolutely, that we are upon Earth: and ſo, he thinks himſelf as ſafely guarded here againſt the *Panis apparet* by this; as before, againſt the Euchariſt being pretended to be *Ipſum Corpus Chriſti* in a litteral or a proper ſenſe, by his ſhewing, that the *poor* were ſaid to be *ipſum*, or *Verum*, *Corpus Chriſti* too.

† *Supr.* p. 286. † l. 4. c. 7.

† *part.* 3. c. 2.

Ib. p. 287.

Such Evidences therefore rejected by M. *Claude*, he requires, for the verifying of *Tranſubſtantiation*, that we produce a Teſtimony,

ſtimony, ſuch as this. *That the Bread is Tranſubſtantiated; or, the Subſtance of Bread is changed into the Subſtance of Chriſts Body.* So that, according to him, The *Bread*, [but, not a *Subſtance*,] is ſaid by them to be changed into Chriſts *Body*, [but, not into a *Subſtance*.] And, by the ſame reaſon, we may ſay; That our Lords Nouriſhment, when he lived here on Earth, being changed into our Lords Body, proves not, that it was changed into the Subſtance of his Body; But ſuppoſe then the Expreſſion running, as he would have it. — *That the Bread is changed into the Subſtance of Chriſts Body*; And, that though it ſeems the Subſtance of Bread; Yet, in truth, it is the Subſtance of Chriſts *Body*, or *Fleſh*, are we ever a whit now the abler to ſilence him? Or, will not his anſwers ſtill fit as well as before, *viz.* That, though it ſeems, yet it is not the *ſimple*, or *naked*, Subſtance of Bread. — That it is, *in truth*, alſo the *Subſtance* of Chriſts Body: *i. e.* containing in it the whole *Vertue* (or, if I may ſo ſay, the *Subſtance*) of this Subſtance. For ſo, it may be ſhewed, ſometimes, that Subſtance is uſed for Vertue.

He Grants†; the Greeks cannot think, *Chriſts Fleſh*, or *Body*, to be the *Subject* of thoſe *accidents*, which are perceived, by our Senſes, to remain in the *Euchariſt*; and then, the Greeks alſo to ſay: *Videtur Panis, & Vinum; in veritate Corpus Chriſti & Sanguis eſt*; and yet will not yield, that they hold the Exiſtence of theſe Appearances or Accidents in the Euchariſt without a Subject. He grants the Greeks to hold, *our Lords Body, that is diſtributed in the Euchariſt, to be indiviſible, impartible, impaſſible*; and then affirms them (though it is not ſo) to ſay; *that no other Subſtance is this Body, than the Bread*; and yet not to hold, the *accidents* only of the Bread to be *paſſible, partible*, &c. The Greeks ſay, *that the Body of our Lord, which is conſecrated and offered in many places at once, and at many times ſucceſſively, yet in all theſe, is but one, and the ſame, Body: and, that, though it is in all theſe places broken, divided, and eaten by many Communicants, yet is received by each of them, not in a piece of it, but whole, and entire: and, after this, remains ſtill, perfect, unconſum'd, alive, immortal.* And yet he ſaith†, the Greeks do not hold or affirm; *Idem Corpus in pluribus locis*: do not maintain a concomitancy of our Lords Fleſh and Blood; nor the exiſtence of his Body in the Euchariſt, after a non-natural manner. And, that the ſame Greeks do hold, the *Subſtance* of that which is offered and diſtributed in one place, as to one perſon, to be *really*, and *numerically* diverſe from that offered, or diſtributed, in another: But, that their meaning only is; that

† *l.* 3. *c.* 10. *p.* 263.

† *l.* 3. *c.* 13.

the *Vertue* of this *Body* is in all places *one*, and the *ſame*; and to all perſons, *whole* and *entire*; and muſt he not ſay alſo, that this Vertue is incorrupted and alive? — *I yield* [ſaith he, † *in anſwer to* D. Arnaud's *Objections touching* Remigius] *that, if the Bread were made the Body of Chriſt in its Subſtance, it would follow, that our Lord would have ſo many Bodies, as he is united,* [i. e. *in his Divinity*,] *to different Breads* [this he grants, notwithſtanding *Remigius* his arguing; *all theſe Breads but one, and the ſame Body, from the ſame Divinity repleniſhing them*; of which more below:] *But, the Bread not being made Chriſts Body ſave only in Vertue, and in efficacy, this conſequence is null; becauſe this Vertue, through the whole world, is one and the ſame. — For this Vertue is indiviſible, and is all of it entire, wherever it is.* Thus he. And, that ſuch are his *anſwers* and *explications*, of theſe expreſſions of the *Greeks*, as I have here repreſented, You may ſee in his 2d. Anſwer *part.* 3. *c.* 2. & 4. — His laſt Anſwer, *l.* 3. *c.* 9 *c.* 10. — *l.* 4. *c.* 7. — *l* 5 *c.* 7. — *l.* 6. *c.* 10. and frequently elſewhere.

2 *Reſp. p.* 514

§. 321. n. 8. [Where chiefly you may obſerve; that, how punctual ſoever the Expreſſions of the Greeks are concerning the preſence of Chriſts very Body, yet he expounds them only of the Vertue, excluſive to the Subſtance, of Chriſts Body. And yet this perſon confeſſeth that the Greeks hold, † — *That the Bread is made the proper Body of Chriſt* [oppoſed to figure] *by the way of Augmentation of his Natural Body; ſo, as our Nouriſhment is made our Body.* And yet, elſewhere, † more fully — † *That* [*upon the Conſecration*] *they held an Union of the Bread with the Divinity of our Lord; and, by the Divinity,* [*an Union*] *to his natural Body; and that they underſtood, that by the means of this Union, or of this Conjunction, the Bread becomes the Body of Chriſt, and is made the ſame Body with it.* [I add, as our nouriſhment, by its union to the ſame Soul, is made the ſame Body with our's.] Now then; when we ſay, that our nouriſhment, upon ſuch an operation paſſing upon it, is, or is changed into, or is made, our Body or Fleſh, did he candidly here interpret our meaning, who ſhould ſay, that we affirm only; that this nouriſhment is our Body, or Fleſh, in *Vertue*, or changed into the *Vertue* of it, excluſively to its being alſo made the *Subſtance* of it? So; doth this perſon deal candidly, for inſtance, when *Euthymius* a Greek Author, that held this opinion, expreſſeth himſelf thus † — *Quemadmodum Jeſus Chriſtus, ſupernaturaliter, aſſumptam carnem deificavit; Etiam Hac* [the Bread and Wine] *ineffabiliter tranſmutat* [i. e. by his united Deity] *in ipſum vivificum*

† *l.* 4. *c* 7.

† *l.* 6. *c.* 10.

Euthym.[9]

† *Comment. in* Matt. *c.* 64

corpus

ficum Corpus, & in ipſum pretioſum ſanguinem ſuum, & in gra- v. in fr. p. 301.
tiam ipſorum. (which Grace he explains preſently after by this Body ſtrengthening us, as Bread doth; and this Blood exhilarating, and encouraging us, as Wine †;) I ſay, doth he deal ingeniouſly, to expound the [&] here by a [C' *eſt à dire,*] or, [*id eſt*] — *Tranſmutat ineffabiliter in ipſum Corpus, & in ipſum Sanguinem, id eſt, in gratiam ipſorum?* Making the Body a Synonyme with its vertue; Such a Synonyme, ſaith he, as that of S. *Paul*, in 1. *Tim.* 4. 3. *They who believe and know the truth.* or 1 *Tim.* 6. 3. *Wholſom words, and Doctrine of Godlineſs.* But might he not have ſaid, more aptly, ſuch a Synonyme as that in *Pſal.* 32. — *Verbo Domini Cæli firmati ſunt, & omnis virtus eorum; firmati ſunt Cæli,* id eſt, *virtus eorum.* Or *Pſal.* 147. — *Magnus Dominus & magna virtus ejus. Dominus,* id eſt, *virtus Domini.* — But, if the Greeks mean, as, he ſaith indeed they do, — That the Bread, by Conſecration, is made out Lords proper Body, though not that Numerical one born of the Virgin, yet another, added to it by way of Augmentation; and ſo, in ſome ſenſe, made the ſame with it, (*viz.* ſo, as our nouriſhment is with ours) by the Union, and inhabitation of our Lords Divinity to, and in, them both; and laſtly, that, by its being thus made our Lords Body, it hath alſo the vivificating vertue of his natural Body, inherent in it; then I ſay; in plain dealing, this Perſon, expounding the Expreſſions of the Greeks, ought to have confeſſed their maintaining the preſence, in the Euchariſt, of this Subſtance of Chriſts Body, as well as of its Vertue; this Subſtance I ſay, of which they affirm, that it is the *ſame* with the other crucifyed ſo far as, to be united to the *ſame Divinity*, and in the *ſame perſon*, of our *Lord*; and, from this, to receive the ſame vivificating Vertue; though indeed this new Subſtance from that crucifyed *numerically* diſtinct. Nor, conſequently, ought he to impoſe upon the Greeks, as every where he doth, their holding the Bread, after Conſecration, to remain ſtill ſo entirely Bread, as it was before; but only, the *matter* of it ſo to remain, as the matter of our Nouriſhment doth, when yet that, which was Bread, is now truly our Fleſh, and no more Bread; our Fleſh, not by *I* know not what Myſtical Relation to it, but by a moſt interior reception, and incorporation into it, and diſperſion through that our Subſtance, or Fleſh, which was exiſtent before. Nor, laſtly, uſing the ſame integrity, ought he to have ſaid, this new Subſtance to have been held by the Greeks *augmentative* of Chriſts Natural Body, or alſo to be the *ſame* with it, (as the Greeks alwayes

† See *Pſalm* 103. 15.

v. p. 303.

ſay it is) by reaſon of a *ſupernatural vertue* of Chriſts Natural Body communicated to it, (as he uſually explains them;) for one thing may have the *Vertue* of another, without being an *augmentative* part of it, or contracting any *Identity* with it: But, that this new Subſtance is held by the Greeks an accruit to our Lords natural Body, and the ſame alſo with it, from its *Union* to the *Divinity*, and ſo its change into Chriſts Fleſh; and ſo its partaking alſo the ἐνεργείας, *Graces*, or *Vertues* of it; which the Greeks ſpeak of, with much reaſon, as well as of the *ſubſtance*, becauſe in theſe we are moſt concern'd.

Thus, perhaps with much leſs labour, might this ingenious Perſon have comprehended in his Anſwers and Explications of the Greek's opinion more Truth, and gained from his Readers more belief. And for this, *I* appeal to any ſober Perſon, when he ſhall have conſidered M *Claudes* conceſſions ſet down below, *n.* 11. and the neceſſary conſequences of them *n.* 12. But this perſon well ſaw the great prejudice he ſhould do to his cauſe in explaining theſe Authors in ſuch a manner (which would have made a fair way at leaſt toward a Total Tranſubſtantiation,) and therefore judged it ſafeſt to hold faſt to a *vertual preſence*. Now, in this way he takes, many of theſe Expreſſions ſeem ſo clearly to ſay the contrary to what he would have them, as a *proof* can hardly be brought againſt ſuch anſwers, that will not have as little, or perhaps leſs, evidence in it, than the thing that is *proved*. And, in ſuch manifeſt wreſting of an Authors clear ſence, it is Conſcience only muſt confute ſuch gain-ſayers, not an Argument. And in ſuch caſes it concerns the Reader not eaſily to reſign his Reaſon to anothers engagements; nor ſuffer his Judgement to be figured with the impreſſions of every mans fancy, (eſpecially when oppoſing Church Authority) nor to apprehend difficulty in every thing ſo long, as he ſees it to be conteſted. This of M. *Claude's* Art in evading of ſuch, as ſeem very evident, and indiſputable Teſtimonies.

p. 306.

§. 321. n. 9. 6. But, 6ly. Suppoſe ſuch clear and expreſs Teſtimonies produced, as that no ſuch anſwers can diſcountenance them; nor no Exceptions be made againſt *them*, ~~then~~, eſpecially out of the 1ſt. and 2d. *Obſervations* precedent; He hath ſome at leaſt againſt the *Perſon*. Urge againſt him the Teſtimonies of the *Modern Greek Writers*, ſuch as will admit none of his Qualifications, He tells us, many of them are Greeks Latiniz'd, and won over to *Rome*: Or, the writing quoted wants another teſtimony,

II. p. 281.

teſtimony, that it is not forged; ſuch as lived in the ſame times, having in their writings not mentioned ſuch a Piece; thus he throws off *Simonas*, and *Agapius*†; Proceed, in adding to theſe the teſtimonies of ſeveral Dignifyed perſons of the *preſent Greek Clergy*; and that in ſeveral Countreys, and Churches of the Eaſt, diſtinct, and averſe, from the Roman Communion. By a diligent Collection of which, his prudent Adverſary, hath done the Church Catholick great ſervice, *in manifeſting, that the doctrine, and practice of the Greeks, not only touching *Real preſence* and *Tranſubſtantiation*; but *moſt* of the other Controverſies agitated in the Weſt, conſents and agrees with the Church of *Rome*, and *in repreſenting to the more ingenuous amongſt Proteſtants, how ſingular they *ſtand*, and divided, in their Faith, from the whole Chriſtian world. He tells us: They are the Declarations only of *Greeks Latinized*, and corrupted by the Roman Miſſions: Though the ſame perſons, ſtill, maintain their diſſent from the *Latines*, as to thoſe Points formerly in Controverſie between the two Churches: and though the Teſtimony, they give, is not ſo much concerning their particular perſwaſion; as, what is the *Common* Tenent, and Profeſſion of the *Greek*, [*i. e.* thoſe no way reconciled to the Roman Communion,] or other *Oriental*, Churches; A matter, wherein a falſe teſtimony, as it would carry a greater guilt, ſo lies too open to diſcovery. Urge to him the teſtimony of the Orientals, eſpecially perſons dignifyed in the Clergy, that have *travailed*, about ſome negociations, into the *Weſt*. He ſaith, *l.* 5. *c.* 5 *p* 594. *There is little credit to be given to this kind of People, who come not uſually into the Weſt, but for their own Intereſt; and who fail not to ſpeak in ſuch a manner, as one would have them.* Urge to him the teſtimony of thoſe of the Greek Communion, *inhabiting* in the *Weſt*, and here indulged their own Service, and Rites, eaſily inquired into; as for example, the Greek Church in *Venice*. See (*Reſpon.* 2. *part.* 2 *c.* 8.) his anſwer to what was urged out of *Gabriel* Archbiſhop of *Philadelphia* the Prelate there. —*That we are not to think it ſtrange, if one, who had lived ſome* 40 *years in that place, ſuffered himſelf*, [and ſo thoſe under his charge,] *to be wrought upon by the ordinary commerce they had with the Latines.* Urge the *Oriental Liturgies*, which, though not denyed to be different in ſeveral Regions, or perhaps ſeveral alſo uſed in the ſame, (as both S. *Baſil*'s and S. *Chryſoſtom*'s are by the Greeks,) yet have a great congruity and harmony both amongſt themſelves, and with the Greek and Roman, as to the Service,

l. p. 281.
l. p. 307.
† *l* 4 *c* 3.

† *His last Answer, l. 5. c. 5. 606. & 608.*

and Ceremonies, of the Eucharist. His answer is †, — *That we have not any certainty, that these Pieces are sincere, or faithfully translated; or, some of them not corrected by the Missions.*

As for the *Liturges*, and other witnesses, produced for the Faith of the *Jacobites of Syria*; *the Armenians*; *Cophtites, or Egyptians*: *Ethiopians, or Abyssines*, agreeing in this Point with the *Roman*, he thinks them all sufficiently confuted, from *Eutychianism* being held by these Eastern, and Southern,

† *l. 5. c. 6. p. 604.*

Churches. For, saith he, † — *What can one find more directly opposite; than, to maintain on one side, that Jesus Christ hath no true Body; that there is nothing in him save only the Divine Nature; that all that which hath appeared, of his Conversation in the World, of his Birth, Death, Resurrection, were nothing but simple appearances without Reality: and, on the other side, to believe, that the substance of the Bread is really changed into the proper substance of his Body, the same he took of the Virgin.* Thus He; for his advantage, applying the *extremities* of that *Heresie* to all these Nations, contrary to the Evidence of their publick *Liturgies*. But *Eutychianism*, taken in the lower sence, as *Eutyches* (upon the mistake of some expressions of former Fathers, *Athanasius*, and *Cyrill*, Patriarchs of *Alexandria*, which perhaps also induced the engagement of *Dioscorus* their Successor on his side) maintained, and the *Ephesin* Council, *i. e.* above 90 Bishops, under *Dioscorus*, allowed; it affirms no more, than — *that the two Natures of our Lord, the one Divine, the other Humane, Consubstantial with us, and received of the Bl. Virgin, after their conjunction, become one, yet this without any confusion, or mixture, or conversion of the two Natures into one another.* Now, that these Nations adhere to *Eutychianism* only in this latter sence, (they not well distinguishing between *Nature*, and *Personality*,) I refer him that desires further satisfaction, to the *Relations* of *Thomas à Jesu*, l. 7. c. 13, 14, 17. — and *Brerewoods Enquiries*. c. 21, 22, 23. — and Dr. *Field on the Church*. l. 3. c. 1. p. 64. *&c.* and of the several Authors cited by them: and to the testimony

† *l. 5. c. 6.*

of *Tecla Maria* a Learned Abyssin Priest cited by M *Claud.* † who saith: They hold, after the Union, only *Unam Naturam*, *sine tamen mixtione, & sine confusione.* [*i. e.* of those two Natures, of which the One, afterward, is compounded.] Which Testimony may serve either to expound, or to confront, one, or two, of the other he brings, that seem to say otherwise.

Urge to him the *Confession* of *Protestants*, *Grotius*, Bishop *Forbes*, and others, (though themselves of a contrary persuasion,) that the Modern Greek Church believes *Transubstantiation*:

riation : for which they cite their *late* Writers; the Reading of whom convinced them in this, though it cannot M. *Claude*. Of theſe two *Grotius* and *Forbes*, he replies, † — *That they are perſons, who permitted themſelves to be pre-poſſeſſed with Chimerical fancies and deſigns, upon the matter of the Differences between the two Communions, Catholick and Proteſtant; which they pretend to accommodate, and reconcile.* So he cenſures *Caſaubon* out of *Spondanus*. † — *Levitatem animi Vacillantem eum perpetuò tenuiſſe; cum & his, & illis placere cuperet, & nulli ſatisfeciſſet.* Where indeed, whoſe judgement ought ſooner to be credited, than theirs, who appear more indifferent between the two contending parties? So, To Archbiſhop *Lanfranck*'s words to *Berengarius*. *Interroga Græcos, Armenios, ſeu cujus libet Nationis quoſcunque homines unoore hanc fidem,* [i. e. *Tranſubſtantiationis*] *ſe teſtabuntur habere*, cited by Dr. *Arnaud*. He anſwers. † — *That Pre-occupation renders his Teſtimonie nothing worth.* † l. 4 c. 4. † p. 361.

Urge the *Socinians*, becauſe the Fathers oppoſe ſo manifeſtly *their* own opinions, therefore more apt to ſpeak the truth of them, in their oppoſing alſo *thoſe* of *other* Proteſtants, and particularly in their differing from them in this point of the Euchariſt; He tells us, they are not creditable in their Teſtimony, becauſe ſo much intereſted, to decry the Doctrine of the Fathers in their own regard; and thus they imagine, Proteſtants will have leſs countenance to preſs them with an Authority, that themſelves cannot ſtand to. Urge the *Centuriſts*, confeſſing Tranſubſtantiation found in ſome of the Fathers; and, in magnifying their new-begun *Reformation*, more free plainly to acknowledge thoſe they thought *errours* of *former* times. He † denies them fit witneſſes in this Controverſie, becauſe, themſelves holding a Real Preſence, they had rather admit a *Tranſubſtantiation* in the Fathers, than a preſence only *Myſtical*. And ſuppoſe ſuch excuſes ſhould fail him; yet how eaſie is it to find ſome other, whereby a perſon may be repreſented never to ſtand in an exact *indifferency*, as to whatever Subject of his Diſcourſe? † l. 1. c. 5.

With ſuch perſonal exceptions M. *Claude* frequently ſeeks to relieve his Cauſe, where nothing elſe will do it. Whereas indeed ſuch a common *Veracity is* to be ſuppoſed amongſt men, eſpecially as to theſe matters of Fact, that, where a multitude, though of a party concern'd, concur in their Teſtimony, they cannot reaſonably be rejected on ſuch an account, either, that their being deceived, or purpoſe to deceive, and to relate a lie,

lie, is poſſible; or, that, what they ſay can be ſhewed a thing well pleaſing, and agreeable, to their own inclinations. For as it is true, that ones own *intereſt*, if, as to his own particular, very conſiderable, renders a Teſtimony leſs credible; So, on the other ſide, almoſt no Teſtimony would be valid, and current, if it is to be decryed, where can be ſhewed ſome favour, or engagement of affection, to the thing, which the perſon witneſſeth: and ſo, for Example, in the Narration of *another* Countreys *Religion*, (often made by all Parties,) none here can be believed, ſave in what he teſtifies of them, againſt his *own*. Such things therefore are to be decided according to the multitude, and paucity, and the Reputation, of the witneſſes rather, than their (*only ſome way general*) intereſt; and the Credibility of ſuch things is to be left to the equal Readers Judgement.

§. 321. n. 10. But, 7ly. Shou'd all that is ſaid touching the later Greek's, from the 11th. or the 8th. to the preſent, age, their holding *Tranſubſtantiation* be, undeniably, made good; and, all the teſtimonies concerning it, exactly true: Yet he ſaith † — *It will not follow, that a change* [of the Churches former Faith in this Point] *is impoſſible: or, hath not actually happened: and conſequently, that all* M. Arnaud's *long diſpute, about it, is vain, and unprofitable.* I add; and then, ſo his Replies. But here, ſince the true *ſence*, and meaning of *Antiquity*, on what ſide This ſtands, is the thing chiefly queſtioned, and debated between the *Roman* Church, and *Proteſtants*, (unleſs he will throw off this too, and retreat, only to *ſenſe of Scripture*,) I ſuppoſe to wiſe men it will ſeem little leſs, than the loſs of the Proteſtant cauſe, and too great a prejudice to it, to be ſo ſlightly yielded up; if that, not the Roman only, but the whole viſible Catholick, Church (beſides themſelves,) from the 11th. to the preſent, age, doth defend a *Corporal preſence*, and a *literal* ſence of *Hoc eſt corpus meum*; or alſo *Tranſubſtantiation*; and ſo, conſequently, doth concur, and Vote againſt them, touching the *ſenſe* of former *Antiquity*; for this, each ſide, in their preſent Doctrine, and Practice, pretend to follow. And I can hardly think M *Claude*, would ſpend ſo great a part of his Book to defend a Poſt, the loſs of which he thought no way harm'd Him. Again; thus it is manifeſt, that in an *Oecumenical Council*, if now aſſembled, the Proteſtants would remain the Party Condemned.

† V. 2. c. 1.

v. p. 283.

8. After

8. After all these Defences, wherewith he seems sufficiently garded; He proceeds *l.* 3. *c.* 13. thus to declare the true opinion of the *Modern Greeks* on this Subject, which I will give you in his own words. *p.* 310. — *They believe* (saith he;) *That by the Sanctification* [or Consecration] *is made a Composition of the Bread and the Wine, and of the Holy Ghost: That these Symboles, keeping their own Nature, are joyn'd to the Divinity, and, That by the impression of the Holy Ghost, they are changed, for the Faithful alone,* [the Body of our Lord being supposed either to be not present at all, or to cease to be so, in the particles of the Symbole received by the unworthy] *into the vertue of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ: being, by this means, made not a Figure, but the proper and true Body of Jesus Christ; and this, by the way of Augmentation of the same natural Body of Jesus Christ. To which they apply the comparison of the nourishment, which is made our own Body by Assimilation, and Augmentation* Again, *p.* 237. more briefly — *The Doctrine of the Greek Church is: That the substance of Bread, conserving its proper Being, is added to the Natural Body of Jesus Christ; that it is rendred like unto it: That it augments, and by this means becomes the same Body with it. By this also* (he saith, *p.* 334. and see the same in his 4 *l.* *c.* 7.) *the Greeks would observe in some sort the literal sense of the words,* Hoc est Corpus meum, *which* (saith He) *we do not; we understand them in this sence: This Bread is the sacred sign, or Sacrament of my Body. Or, which comes to the same pass, The Bread signifies my Body. They, on the contrary, taking the word* [is,] *in some sort according to the letter, would have, that the same subject which is the Bread is also the Body of Christ. From preserving this pretended literal sence it is also; That they would have it; That the Bread is made one with the Body, by its Union to the Divinity, by the Impression of the Holy Ghost, and by a change of vertue. Or,* as he hath it in his 6. *l.* *c.* 10. — *That there is an Union of the Bread to the Divinity of our Lord; and by the Divinity, to his natural Body: by means of which Union, or Conjunction, the Bread becomes the Body of Christ, and made the same Body with it.* [with his natural Body.] Again, for preserving this literal sence, *That they bring the comparison of Nourishment made One with our Body; and that they have invented this way of Augmentation of the natural Body* [of Christ.] *It seems also, That the Modern Greeks understand some real or Physical impression of the Holy Ghost, and of the vivificating vertue of Jesus Christ, upon the Bread, with some kind of inherence,* [*i. e.* of the vertue]

§. 321. n. 11.

11. *supr.* p. 285.

Although I will not (saith he) *ascertain positively, that this is the General Belief of their Church, though the expressions seem to sway on this side. But however it be, this is not our opinion. We believe, that the Grace of the Holy Ghost, and vertue of Christs Body, accompanies the lawful use of the Sacrament; and, that we partake the Body of Jesus Christ by Faith, as much or more really, than if we received it in the mouth of our Body. But we understand* this *Real impression, or inherence,* [*i. e.* of the Supernatural Vertue of the Body of Christ, † *viz.* that born of the Virgin,] *of the Greeks. Whence it is, that our Expressions are not so high, as theirs.* And this Opinion of theirs he makes to be as ancient as *Damascen* — *This Opinion* [of the Modern Greeks, saith he] *seems to be taken from* Damascen: *some of whose expressions I think fit to produce. For it is certain, that, to make a good Judgement of the Opinion of the modern Greeks, we must ascend as high as him.* — *And M.* Arnaud *himself hath observed, That* John Damascen *is as it were the* S. Thomas *of the Greeks.* Thus He.

II. v. p. 285.

See p. 338.

† l. 3. c. 13. p. 315.

§. 321. n. 12.

But, lest he should seem to fasten such a gross Opinion upon the Greek Church as they will not own, nor others easily believe, they maintain; (for he confesseth, that it hath something in it, that appears *little reasonable*; and especially, as to the Augmentation of Christs natural Body, to be *assez bizarre*†;) and lest he should make it lyable to so many and odious absurdities, as that a *Transubstantiation*, which he endeavours to avoid, may seem much the more plausible, and eligible of the two; perhaps I say for these considerations, he undertakes to qualifie, and render a credible and likely sence to it on this manner: In saying, 1. That they hold indeed an *Union* of the *Divinity* to the Bread, and that in an higher manner, than to any other Sacred sign, or Ceremony; but yet not *Hypostatical*. 2. That they hold the Bread changed into an augmentative part of Christ's natural Body; but, it remaining still *entire* Bread as before, and altered only in a *Supernatural vertue*, added to it. 3. Hold it to be joyned to Christs Body and augmenting it; but so, as to be not *individually* the same, but *numerically* distinct from it, as also those new parts we receive by nourishment are distinct from all the former parts of our Body. 4. To be joyned to this natural Body of Christ, not locally, or so it as present in the Eucharist; but, as in Heaven. How this? As, saith he, a Mystery may be said to be an Appendix, or Accessory, to the thing, of which it is a Mystery. And, to these 4 Qualifications this Author seems necessitated; because, otherwise, *Adoration, and Transubstantiation, in some part*, tho

II. Supr. p. 284.

II. Supr. p. 285.

not

not a total; *Exiſtence of the Accidents without a Subject*; *The ſame Body at once in many places*; and ſeveral other Conſequents, thus appearing alſo in the Greek's Opinion, would have given too much countenance to the Roman.

Where you may obſerve; that there are three things wherein his explaining of this Opinion, he imputes to the Greeks, to render it more remote from the Latines, falls ſhort of that, which, according to the Compariſon, and the expreſſions, they uſe, he is juſtly obliged to maintain. §. 321. n. 13

1. The firſt, That the *Union* of the Divinity to the Conſecrated Bread, is *Hypoſtatical* or Perſonal. For ſuch an Union had our Lords *Divinity* to the *Nouriſhment*, (to which this is compared) received by him, and added to his natural Body, born of the Bleſſed Virgin: † And no leſs Union than this will ſerve to make the Euchariſtical Bread one, and the ſame, with it (a thing conſtantly affirmed by the Greeks,) at leaſt as to the *Suppoſitum*; or to make both theſe the Body of the ſame *Perſon*. *The difference of the Union*, (ſaith M. *Claude* †) *is diſcerned by the difference of the effect it produceth in the things.* Now what thing more is requiſite to ſtile it an Union Hypoſtatical (*Hypoſtaſis*, and *Subſiſtentia*, or *Perſona*, with the Greeks, importing the ſame thing,) than this effect, that it renders this Body, to which it unites it ſelf, and that Body born of the Bleſſed Virgin, the ſame Body of one *Perſon*: and this Union gives to this *new* Body the ſelf-ſame vivicating vertue, Phyſically inherent, as it doth to the other *Natural*? And then, ſuch an Hypoſtatical Union, if granted, will infer the ſame Dignity of this breaden body with the other: the ſame Ceremonies of Honour and Adoration due: Things, which this Perſon is unwilling to hear of; and that would ruine his Cauſe.

See M. Claud 2 *Anſw part.* 2. c. 2 p. 249

† *l.* 6. *c.* 10. p. 867. *v. infr. p.* 309.

2d. That there is a Subſtantial change of the Bread; *i. e.* of the ſubſtantial form of Bread at leaſt; in that this Bread is truly made the Fleſh, and Blood, and animated with the humane Soul, of our Lord, as well as, united to his Divinity: For ſo the *Nouriſhment* received by our Lord on Earth, and added to his Body born of the Virgin, remained not, ſtill, *Bread*; but was truly changed into his *Fleſh*; and ſo alſo is ours. And the *Expreſſions* of the Greeks are ſuitable, and cannot, without an unjuſt force and ſtraining, be otherwiſe explicated. §. 321. n. 14

To inſtance in one or two. Such is that of *Theophilact*, in *Matt.* 26, — *Non enim dixit: Hæc eſt figura; ſed Hoc eſt Corpus meum. Ineffabili enim operatione transformatur, etiamſi nobis videatur Panis, quoniam infirmi ſumus & abhorremus crudas*

carnes comedere, maximè hominis carnem: & ideo Panis quidem apparet, sed reverâ Caro est. And in *Marc.* 14. — *Et quomodo, inquis Caro non videtur? Sanguinem propositum, & carnem videntes, non ferremus sed abhorremus. Idcirco misericors Deus, nostræ infirmitati condescendens, speciem quidem Panis, & Vini servat; in virtutem autem carnis & sanguinis transelementat.* Where, if *Theophylact* had meant by [*Caro verè est,*] *Caro tantùm in virtute est,* he would never have given this reason, in his comment on *Matt.* — *Panis apparet, quod verè est Caro, quoniam infirmi sumus, & abhorremus crudas carnes:* but rather would have removed all difficultie here, and prevented such a Question; *Cur Caro non videtur?* by telling them: *Ut apparet, ita est, Panis: Caro autem est, non verè, aut in substantiâ, sed tantùm in Virtute.* This had been plain dealing: but then he had overthrown his Text: *Hoc est Corpus meum, non figura Corporis mei;* and made it only, (as M. *Claude* doth,) at the most, *Hoc est Efficax figura Corporis mei, non ipsum Corpus.* As for the pains M. *Claude* hath taken † to qualifie this *Panis apparet, caro verè est,* in mingling together *Theophylact's* Comments on *Matt. Mark,* and *John;* and in taking *Speciem Panis* in S. *Mark,* not for the shew, or appearance; but Substance, of Bread (by which it should run, not *verè Caro,* but *verè Panis,* in his Comment on S. *Matt.*) and in understanding *Virtus Carnis* in S. *Mark,* with a *tantùm;* (so as this excludes *verè Caro,* in S. *Matt.*) I am confident, that the ingenious Reader will find therein only great industry used to obsure a clear Truth.

[For *Vertue* may be used as well ~~augmentatively~~ connotatively, as ~~diminutively~~ exclusively, in respect of Substance; as including Substance, and adding something to it, and as opposing an outward shew only without Reality, or a Substance without efficacy; as D. *Arnaud* † hath judiciously observed; and, for clearing it, instanced in that of St. *Paul* 2 *Tim.* 3. 5. — *Habentes speciem quidem pietatis, virtutem ejus abnegantes:* and that of S. *Greg. Nyssen. Orat. Catechet. c.*37. — *Igitur unde in illo corpore* [of our Lord, when here on Earth] *transmutatus Panis transit in Divinam virtutem; per idem* [Verbum] *nunc fit similiter; Nam & illic Gratia Verbi Corpus, cui ex pane erat substantia & quodammodo ipsum erat Panis, sanctum fecit: & hic* [in the Eucharist] *similiter, Panis, sicut dicit Apostolus, sanctificatur, per Verbum Dei, & orationem; non eo quidem, quod, per comestionem & bibitionem, in Verbi Corpus evadat; sed quod, statim, per Verbum in Corpus transmutetur, sicut dictum est à Verbo: Hoc est Corpus meum* And afterwards he saith, — *In illud* [Corpus immortale Christi, mentioned before

[fore

|| infr. p. 301.

† l. 4. c. 7. p. 448.

|| infr. p. 301.

|| Exclusively

† l. 2. c. 9 p. 186.

|| supr. p. 285.

fore] *transelementatâ eorum quæ apparent, Naturâ* Which place, because D. *Arnaud* much pressed as throughly clearing that of *Theophylact*, our Lords *Nourishment* being changed, as into the vertue, so doubtless also into the *Substance* of his Bodie; and because it is that place, from which first Source M. *Claude*, † derives the Modern Greek Opinion, I was curious to search what M. *Claude* would say to it; but I found him, as to speak to that of S. *Paul*, and other passages, so, prudently, to pass over this, the most insisted on by his Adversary, in silence. But who pleaseth may see in another place † (where it is urged against Protestants for Transubstantiation) how miserably this plain passage of this Father suffers under his Exposition of it: Whilst this Expression (*dure & irregulier*, as he cals it) represents nothing else, but *Damascen's* and the Modern Greek Opinion to any one, that hath not shut his eyes, and shews the modern and ancient Greek Church to be all of one Faith. Here then you see, in *Greg. Nyssen*, Virtus *includes* Substance; Now see it in that place of *Euthymius* cited before †, *added* to Substance, as being indeed the main thing to be insisted on.—*Hæc ineffabiliter* (saith he) *transmutat in ipsum vivificum Corpus, & in ipsum pretiosum sanguinem suum,* [& *in Gratiam* [or virtutem, or vim] *eorum*: which Grace he explains presently after, by this Body strengthening us as Bread doth; and this Blood exhilarating us, as Wine†. And see *Theophylact's* Comment on *Joh.* 6. the like addition.—*Panis*, (saith he, speaking of our Lords nourishment,) *in corpus ejus mutabatur* [there is the change of the Substance.]—*Et in augmentum & sustentamentum conferebat*, [there is the vertue.] Again,—*Ita & nunc Panis in Carnem Domini mutatur* [there is the Substance;] *Nec nudi hominis Caro est, sed Dei, & qua deificare valet* [there is the Vertue.] Now, *Virtus* taken thus in *Theophylact*, all things in him agree well together: Thus, it suits well with, *verè Caro est?*—with, *Ineffabilis Operatio*, Language not so usual for a change of vertue only.—With the Question, *Cur non videtur Caro?* simply asked, if *Theophylact* spake only of a change of vertue, and not Substance too, and if this then the known common Doctrine.—With his answer to the Question; which, as I have shew'd, in case he held a presence of vertue only, ought to have been quite another; and such as a Protestant now would give. Lastly, it suits well with his former arguing.—*Non enim Dixit; Hoc est Figura Corporis, sed, Hoc est Corpus,* (which, if good, must hold as well of *virtus*, or of any thing else, that is not *ipsum Corpus*) But Vertue taken so exclusively, overturns all; and makes *Theophylact* contradict himself, that he may not,

† *l.* 3. *c* 13.

†2 *Resp. part.* 2. *c* 2.

† §. 321. n. 8.

n. supr. p. 291.

† See *Psal.* 103. 15.

n. supr. p. 300.

n. supr. p. 300.

M. *Claude.* Thus much in vindication of the true ſence of *Vertue*, when uſed by the *Greek Authors*.]

A like paſſage to this in *Theophylact*, ſee in *Remigius Antiſiodor*: *in Expoſ. Miſſæ*, a follower, as M. *Claude* grants † of the Opinion of *Damaſcen*, and the Greeks. — *Cum Myſterium ſit* (ſaith he) *quod aliud ſignificat, ſi* [Euchariſtia] *in veritate Corpus Chriſti eſt, quare appellatur myſterium? Propterea utique, quia poſt Conſecrationem aliud eſt, aliud videtur. Videtur ſiquidem Panis & Vinum; ſed in veritate Corpus Chriſti eſt & ſanguis. Conſulens ergo omnipotens Deus infirmitati noſtræ, qui uſum non habemus comedere Carnem crudam & ſanguinem bibere, facit, ut in priſtinâ remaneant formâ illa duo munera, etſi, in veritate, Corpus Chriſti & Sanguis, ſicut ipſe dixit, &c.* Where *Priſtina forma* cannot be extended to the internal ſubſtantial Form or Eſſence of Bread ſtill remaining, as M. *Claude* † would divert the ſence; For this internal Form or Eſſence, either in the Bread, or Fleſh, ſince not ſeen, neither cauſeth, nor removeth Horrour and the maintaining of this Form, ſuits not with the, *In veritate Chriſti Corpus eſt*; and *verè Caro eſt*, in theſe Authors; which expreſſions do imply, *In veritate*, not *Panis*; but is to be underſtood only of the *external form*, and other qualities thereof, occurring to ſence, the ſight, taſte, *&c.* For, ſo that the Euchariſt hath all theſe exterior qualities of Bread, where we do not ſee, or taſte, we dread not, crude Fleſh; and the horrour, we have, is from its *appearing*, not from its *being*, Fleſh. Now this, [*Panis quidem apparet: Caro verè eſt,*] of the Greeks, what is it, but ſaying the ſame thing with that of the Latines. — *Subſtantia panis mutatur in carnem, licet remaneant adhuc accidentia Panis, quæ ſub ſenſum cadunt.* And Hence, when, upon an unuſual expreſſion happening in the Council at *Conſtantinople* under *Conſtantius*, *Copronymus*, [*that the only Image adorable, was the* εἰκὼν ἀχειρόπλαστος, Corporis Chriſti *in the Holy Sacrament*] the *Real* and *corporal preſence*, from a jealouſie, (though cauſleſs as this Council explained it ſelf) that this expreſſion might vary, or derogate ſomething from it, began now to be more particularly inſiſted upon and explicated, a curious Queſtion aroſe among the Greeks, as well as Latines: whether, upon the Bread being thus changed, and becoming our Lords Body, the Body of our Lord were digeſtible, and corruptible? which cauſed to ſome, affirming it, the imputation of *Stercoraniſm*. But ſuch odious name, ſurely, theſe could never have incurr'd, no more than now Proteſtants do, had they held, (at leaſt, as the oppoſite party underſtood them)

† *l.* 6 *c.* 10. *p.* 862.

† *p.* 869.

only

only a vivificating vertue of our Lords Body to reſide in the Bread, and not the very Subſtance of his Body to be preſent inſtead of it, according to the then common Opinion.

This of the 2d. thing, wherein M. *Claude's* explication is deficient; the change the Greeks held of the Bread, into the Subſtance of our Lords Body, at leaſt ſo far, as our Nouriſhment is, into the Subſtance of ours, the principal reaſon of their uſing this ſimilitude; Yet, wherein M. *Claude* deſerts it, though, in ſome other things, more advantagious to him, (as in the matter of the nouriſhment ſtill remaining, and that numerically diſtinct from the Body nouriſhed,) he preſſeth it too far. Now this 2d. thing, [the Bread in the Euchariſt its receiving ſuch a change, as our Nouriſhment,] once granted, will be at leaſt an half-Tranſubſtantiation of it; the Subſtantial Form of Bread being gone; the former Qualities of Bread gone, *viz.* from their any longer inherence in the Bread; So that the Subſtance, not of Bread, but of Fleſh, is alſo under the former Accidents of the Bread; The name alſo gone with the thing; it being in truth now no more to be called *Bread*, but *the Fleſh* of our Lord. And ſo, when the Bread is ſaid by S. *Damaſcen.* to be united to the Divinity, it muſt be underſtood ſo, as that, in the Union, it becomes another thing; though ſtill it remains a *diverſe* thing from the Divinity. Hence alſo the pretence of the Bread its being made our Lords body only in *Vertue*, not in *Subſtance*, gone; and all M. *Claud's* queſt after this word *Vertue* in the Greek Authors uſeleſs, and his Deſcants upon it unſound: of which enough hath been ſaid already, §. 321. n. 8. *ll. v. p. 309.*

The 3d. (If we may proſecute their *ſimilitude* of *nouriſhment* to its utmoſt extent,) That there is a local Union of the Bread and the Body of our Lord; not, by way of Accumulation, and Addition: or of Continuation only; as a Leg and an Arm are joyned in the ſame Body; but by way of an interior reception one into the other, and the moſt intimate commixtion and confuſion of them, as to the leaſt natural parts, that are diviſible, and capable of a digeſtion, one within the other: So as the leaſt part of one cannot be ſevered from the other, or communicated without the other; and, as to any actual ſeparation of them, (a thing not feible,) they may be ſaid to be *numerically* the ſame; which comes alſo the neareſt to a *total* tranſition, even of its *matter* alſo, into another Subſtance; though, as to this total Converſion, we muſt permit the operation of Gods Omnipotency (out of his infinite kindneſs to us) in §. 321 n. 15. *p. 291.*

in the Holy Eucharist to ſtand ſingular, and unparallel'd by any work of Nature.

All theſe three therefore the Author, in dealing ingenuouſly with the Greek's compariſon, and their expreſſions, as it ſeems to me, ought to have allowed. But this, probably, he much dreaded; as ſeeing he might as well, nay in ſome reſpects better, have admitted a total Tranſubſtantiation of matter as well as Form; which would have avoided thoſe many prejudices and indignities, which an *Impanation* labours under. But yet thus the Sentiment of the Greeks, ſuppoſing no total Converſion, is advanced far beyond not only M. *Claud's*, and the Calviniſts, *vertual preſence*, but alſo the Lutherans *Conſubſtantiation*. For, whereas theſe hold only Bread, and Chriſts natural Body joyned in the Euchariſt, ſo that the Body and the Bread are two ſeveral things ſtill, this Opinion holds the one changed into the other ſo, as that, as *Jeremy* the Patriarch of *Conſtant.* replyed upon the Lutherans in his 2d. Anſw. † (and as *Damaſcen* alſo ſaid long before. ||) — *Non duo jam ſunt* [*i. e.* as the Lutherans ſaid, *Panis*, and, *Corpus Chriſti*, joyn'd,] *ſed unum, & idem.* [*i. e.* Corpus Chriſti *only*.] The Bread made his natural Fleſh; animated with his Soul; Hypoſtatically united to his Divinity: in fine, the ſame with his Body, as much at leaſt as our Nouriſhment, interiorly received, and digeſted, is with ours.

† c. 4.

|| *De Fid. Orthod. l. 4. c. 14*

§.321.n.16. Thus far the *Greeks* uſual *ſimile* carries us. But their common Doctrine farther, even to a *Total Tranſubſtantiation*, as I think will appear from what follows.

1. For, 1ſt. They hold; that the ſame *Numerical* Body of our Lord, that was born of the Virgin, and Crucifyed, is exhibited to us in the Euchariſt: Preſent, not by its deſcending from Heaven; but, by the Converſion of the Conſecrated Elements into the ſelf-ſame Body, and by the multiplication of its *local Exiſtence* in more places, than before.

1. Which appears; 1ſt. From this; That the Identity of the Body Conſecrated, and that Crucifyed, *quoad ſuppoſitum*, or as both united to, and filled with, the ſame Divinity, (which well conſiſts with a, Real, Subſtantial, Numerical, diverſity between themſelves,) is not ſufficient, that the one of them, therefore, may be denominated of the other; or this ſaid to be that; nor yet ſufficient, that *all* the ſame things may be ſaid of them both. Some *general* things indeed may be predicated of them, wherein both agree; but their Properties *individual*, as *local preſence*, *Motion*, any *particular* Qualities or applications of

them cannot: (Yet which *Individual* properties are uſually applyed by the Greeks to the Body Crucifyed, and to that diſtributed in the Euchariſt, as one, and the ſame.) Any Individual Properties of the one or the other, I grant, may alwayes be truly demonſtrated of our Lords *Body in general*, as we will; But cannot be truly ſaid of both, or either of *theſe*, the *Conſecrated*, and the *Crucifyed*, as we pleaſe, if theſe not numerically the ſame. So we cannot ſay, That ones Soul is his Body; or a Leg, an Arm; or, the one in the ſame place, or motion, or every way affected, as the other is, becauſe that both are parts of one and the ſame Perſon, or Body, and both animated with one and the ſame Soul. And, for a Grecian Prieſt to tell his Communicants, that he delivers them the ſame Body that was Crucifyed and offered for their Salvation, and Redemption (when he gives them neither it, nor any part of it,) becauſe he gives them another Augmentative Breaden part, belonging to the ſame Perſon, which Perſon indeed was Crucifyed for them, ſeems too bold an Equivocation to be, by this Perſon, ſo confidently impoſed on the Greek Church, and their ordinary expreſſions. The *Truth* therefore of that, which the Greeks, or other Latines, embracing their Opinion, do affirm; *viz.* that the Euchariſts, Conſecrated in never ſo many places, are all the ſelf-ſame Body, one with another; and all with the Crucifyed; becauſe repleniſhed every where with the ſame *Divinity*, muſt be underſtood to proceed, not from the meer Union, or Conjunction, how intimate ſoever, of theſe two (as is ſhewed but now:) but to proceed from the effect (as M. *Claude*, preſſed with his Adverſaries Arguments, confeſſeth†) from the effect, I ſay which this Divinity, firſt uniting, or conjoyning it ſelf to the Elements upon the words of Conſecration, worketh in them, to make them, by a total Tranſmutation of their Subſtance, (for nothing leſs can do it) individually all one, and the ſame, with one another, and with that crucifyed; after which follows another, an *Hypoſtatical Union* of the ſame Divinity to them, as made our Lords Body.

† p. 867. *ſupr* p. 299.

2. Again: Their holding a *Numerical* Identity every where of this Body of our Lord appears from this; that they explain its being, in all places, but one; and in every place, and in every Particle whole and intire, by the *Divinity*'s being ſo; and the Divinity is ſo, numerically. See that paſſage of *Remigius*, and *Alcuin*. (cited by M. *Claude l.* 6. *c.* 10.) concerning the *effect* of this repletion of the Conſecrated Elements by the Divinity. — *Sicut Divinitas Verbi Dei una eſt*, [una numero]

mero] *qua totum implet mundum; Ita licet multis locis, & innumerabilibus diebus, illud Corpus conſecretur, non ſunt tamen multa corpora Chriſti, neque multi Calices; ſed unum Corpus Chriſti, & unus Sanguis cum eo quod ſumpſit in utero Virginis & quod dedit Apoſtolis. Divinitas enim verbi replet illud quod ubique eſt,* [the Bread] *& conjungit, ac facit* [by a tranſmutation of this Bread by the Divinity joyn'd to it] *ut, ſicut ipſa* [Divinitas, quæ totum implet mundum, tamen] *una eſt, ita* [quod ubique eſt, or Panis] *conjungatur* [i. e. by ſuch a tranſmutation of it] *Corpori Chriſti, & unum corpus ejus ſit in veritate.* [i.e. one not only, as to the Perſon, but one in Reality and Eſſence, as the Divinity is one; and otherwiſe, that, which follows, and which he collects from this Unity, cannot be true.] *Unde animadvertendum eſt, quòd ſive plus ſive minus quis inde percipiat, omnes æqualiter Corpus Chriſti integerrimè ſumunt, & generaliter omnes, & ſpecialiter unuſquiſque.* Certainly, where the whole is in every part, and every part (if I may ſo ſay) contains in it the whole, here is ſuppoſed a *numerical* Identity, and a *ſicut Divinitas una eſt.* Nor hath M. *Claude*, in his holding the Subſtance of the Euchariſt, in ſeveral places, really diverſe, and ſo, to each Communicant, any way to relieve himſelf in anſwer to ſuch expreſſions, neceſſarily inferring a total Tranſubſtantiation, but by inducing *vertual preſence* only, which Vertue he ſaith is every where numerically the ſame; and whole, and entire, to every Receiver. This for *Remigius.*

p. 292. 308.

And here alſo, if we may make uſe of a Negative Argument (which is ſometimes very weak, ſometimes very ſtrong, and convincing, according to the circumſtances, which muſt be left to the prudent to conſider,) whereas the Greek Doctors, had they declared the Body of our Lord, that is diſtributed in the Euchariſt, to be *really* diverſe from that on the Croſs; and when Conſecrated in ſeveral places diverſe one from another, (a neceſſary conſequent, as M. *Claude* ſaith, of their Tenent,) might have rendred this Myſtery much more eaſie, and intelligible; Yet they have never mentioned any ſuch diverſity; but ſtill, as it were to prevent and ſtrangle any ſuch fancy, cautiouſly added, that it is *one* and the *ſame* with that which was born, and dyed for us; And, for this *numerical* Identity, urge our Lords own words†; — *Hoc eſt illud, quod tradetur*, that Fleſh of his, that was to be Crucifyed; and ſo for his Blood, *qui effundetur*, that was to be ſhed on the Croſs. As if our Lord would make this for ever a firm Article of our Faith, and prevent all ſuch Equivocation, as *eadem caro quoad ſuppoſitum*, or *perſonam.*

† *Matt.* 26. 28 *Luke* 22. 19.

perſonam. And, upon this ſuppoſition of the ſame numerical Body here preſent, the *Greeks* (miſtaking the ſence of it) cenſure the expreſſion of the *Latines* in their Canon. — *Jube hæc perferri per manus ſancti Angeli tui in ſupercæleſte Altare tuum,* &c. as incongruous, if pronounced after the Conſecration once ended. For ſo, ſaith *Cabaſilas* †, *Quomodo fuerit, ſi nondum eſt, ſupercæleſte ipſum Corpus Chriſti, quod eſt ſupercæleſte? Quomodo ſurſum ferretur in manu Angeli, quod ſupra omnem Principatum,* &c. [that is above already,] But this *Quomodo* might ſoon have been anſwered by himſelf, if he held this Conſecrated here a new body, really diſtinct from that above. This, of the 1ſt. proof of a Total Tranſubſtantiation, the Greek's holding the Euchariſt the ſame numerical body with that Crucifyed; which, according to M. *Claude*, neceſſarily infers a total Tranſubſtantiation of the *Bread*, as well for its matter, as Form. 2.

Liturg expoſ. c. 30.

2ly. They hold the *Body*, that is thus preſent by Conſecration, to be *incorruptible*; and this Incorruption of it to depend on its *Reſurrection*, and ſo, to relate, only, to that numerical *Body* that was Crucifyed, and Raiſed from Death. — *Quod nec læditur, nec corrumpitur, nec in ſeceſſum abit: Hoc avertat Deus*, ſaith *Damaſcen*: and therefore the Greeks, who are ſaid generally to follow his Opinion, muſt, in Juſtice, be freed from *Stercoraniſm.* Now the *Bread*, remaining entire for its whole Subſtance, or for its Matter and qualities at leaſt, as before Conſecration, cannot be held ſuch a *Body* of our Lord, as ſuffers no digeſtion, or *corruption.* For, ſomething there is in the Sacrament, that ſuffers this: And we cannot imagine, that the Greeks, whilſt holding the Subſtance of *Bread* to remain, will lay theſe changes only upon the *Species*, or *Accidents* of it; and not the Subſtance at all; ſo that, though they eat the *Bread*, they taſte, and are fed only by the Accidents; and ſo, without a Tranſubſtantiation, will eſpouſe the difficulties of it. Their holding, then, the Body, that is preſent, and participated in the Euchariſt, to be *incorruptible*, excludes the Subſtance, or matter, of Bread from this Body. And, — *Panis quidem videtur*, or, *apparet, ſed revera Caro eſt*: as *Theophylact.*† — *Corpus Chriſti non particulatim diducitur*, &c. — *Partitio eſt accidentium, ſub ſenſum cadentium*; as *Samonas*: ‖ — *Non Panis, ſed Corpus Domini ſacrificatur*: — and — *Si Panis manens, ſacrificatus fuiſſet, Panis eſſet Sacrificium, non Agni Dei*: as *Cabaſilas*:‖ muſt all be underſtood of an entire change of the Bread, as well its *Matter* as *Form.*

§. 321. n. 17.

2.

† *In Matt. 26*

‖ *Dialog. cum Saraceno.* *p. 293.*

‖ *Liturg. Expoſitio. c. 32.*

§. 321. n. 18. 3. 3ly. They hold this Body, that is present, and distributed in the Eucharist, to remain, — *quoties frangitur, totum, & integrum in unoquoque fruſto*: And, — *Omnibus diſtributum, minimè diminutum.* — *Frangitur Agnus Dei, & non comminuitur; ſemper comeditur, & non conſumitur*; ſaith their Liturgy||. Not a ſeveral piece, or part of the Lords Body received in the ſeveral Particles, but all: Nor, thoſe receiving more of this *Body*, that receive more of the *Symbole*: In infinite places offered only the ſame Sacrifice; *viz.* that one which was offered on the Croſs To ſeveral Communicants diſtributed the ſelf ſame Body; and: It to each entire; A Tenent flowing from the former. Its *incorruptibility* (and by all the ſame perſons maintained.) For, what is ſo, is no more capable of being parted, or divided, *&c.* Now theſe things cannot ſuit to our Lords Body, if the matter of Bread be ſaid, ſtill to remain, and to make up an augmentative part of our Lords natural Body, but this numerically and really diſtinct from it. For ſo, in ſeveral places will be offered Sacrifices, but theſe really different from one another, as alſo from that of the Croſs: Nor will the Communicants receive our Lords Body entire, but each a part; and this part numerically differing from that *Corpus, quod traditum eſt* (which Communion of a parcel was a thing objected to the Stercoraniſts, and thoſe, who held our Lords Body corruptible.) See M. *Claud's* Conceſſions concerning this, 2d. Anſw. *part.* 3. *c.* 2. and ſo his retreat to a *Virtual preſence*, to verifie theſe expreſſions of the Greeks, of this Body *every where* the ſame, and received by *every one* entire.

||*Miſſa Chryſoſtom.*

v 306.

§. 321. n. 19. As for ſome ſpeeches uſed by the Greeks, in making application of their Similitudes, (none of which can exactly fit ſo high a Myſtery,) that ſeem not to accord ſo well with a Total Tranſubſtantiation. — *The Bread ſaid by them to be aſſumed by, or united to, the Divinity of our Lord*: — *The Bread, and his Body, by the Divinity, to be made One*: — *An Augmentation of Chriſts Body to be made by the Bread conſecrated, as, here on Earth, by his Nouriſhment*, &c. I ſee no Reaſon, why this Perſon ſhould not be contented with the former Explications given of them; Such, as [1] both free theſe Authors from contradicting themſelves; and [2] do render the ſence of the Fathers unanimous, and the Chriſtian Doctrine to run all in one common Stream; [viz. *the Real Preſence, and Exhibition, in the Euchariſt, of that numerical Body thus ſuffered for us on the Croſs*;] [3]. and whereby alſo may be avoided thoſe many groſs abſurdities concerning *new* Contacts, and Unions, and *new* Bodies of our Lord, which, being

being so unworthy these high Mysterious, and very injurious to our Lords Incarnation, are all avoided by a *total* Transubstantiation. See, if you please, these absurdities mentioned by *Bellarmine De Euchar.* l. 3. c. 13. [illegible] and by *Suarez. De Sacrament. Disp.* 49. §. 3. The *Divinity* of our *Lord*, then, may be said to *assume*, or unite it self unto the *Bread*; or, to make the *Bread* one with his *Body*, not by a meer joyning it to Himself, or to his Body, whilst it remains still Bread; but, by his first *converting* and *changing* of it, by his Divine Omnipotency, into his Body, and then, his uniting, Hypostatically, his Divinity to it. And, his Body may be said in some sort to receive daily an *Augmentation* from these iterated Consecrations of Bread to be made his Body, in as much as there is a daily *multiplication* of his Body, as to its local Existence in more places than before, according to the frequency of Communions; whilst his Body, in Heaven, doth not descend, but keeps its constant former residence there. n. 2. 303.

Thus Greeks and Latines, former and latter times, will be at some accord. Whereas this Author, to maintain a variance between the two Churches, seems necessitated to fasten on the Greeks an Opinion, which being taken in its just extent, Transubstantiation seems much the more eligible; and which he is forced many times also to pare, and qualifie so, that it may have some Conformity to the Doctrine of Protestants, and keep a greater distance from the Roman, as offers extreme violence to the natural sence of their words. §. 321. n. 20.

For Example. He allows, * an Union of the Divinity to our Lords Body in the Eucharist, as the Greeks say; But no such Union *Hypostatical*. * Christ's body in the Eucharist the same with that born of the Blessed Virgin, as they say; but in such a sence as mean-while to remain *really*, *essentially*, *numerically*, diverse from it. * The Bread, the same body with that born of the Virgin; but, It not changed into Christs Flesh, but remaining still *Bread*. * Bread still, not only for the matter; as it was in our Lords, or is in our, nourishment; but, for the same Substantial Form, and Qualities, still inhering in it, as before. * The Bread made the *very*, and true, body, as they say: But *virtually* only, in having infused into it, and inherent in it, the vivificating virtue of Christs natural body; (Where the *Protestants* leave the *Greeks* to stand by themselves; allowing this Vertue communicated to the *Believer* only, not to the *Symbols*.) * The Eucharistical body conjoyn'd (as our nourishment is to ours,) to Christs natural body, as they say, but the one only in *Heaven*, the other on *Earth*. * Our

Lords Body in the Euchariſt, by the ſame Divinity inhabiting in both, made one and the ſame with that born of the Virgin, as they ſay; but *Myſtically* and *Sacramentally* only. For the ſame Divinity, repleniſhing both, doth not, therefore, render them really the ſame one with another. * The ſame Body this, with that; but no Sovereign Adoration due, or by the Greeks given, to this, as to that. * This the ſame body with that; and this alſo, as indiviſible, received entire by every Communicant, as the Greeks ſay; But this *Body* entire, in vertue only, not in Subſtance. * The ſame *Body* of our Lord in all places, where this Sacrament is celebrated; But only in the former ſence; *i. e.* the vertue and the efficacie of it, the ſame. If ſuch be their ſence, the Reader cannot but think the Greeks very unfortunate in their Expreſſions; or, if not their ſence, this perſon preſuming, he ſhould meet with very credulous Readers. This (from n. 11.) of the 8th. Obſervation, M. *Claud*'s explication of the *true Opinion of the Modern Greeks*; and the neceſſary *conſequents* of it.

§. 321. n. 21 9ly. After this, He confeſſeth; That it doth not appear, that the Greeks have made any Oppoſition to the Roman Church about Tranſubſtantiation. *l.* 4. *c.* 5. *p.* 390. — *In a word*, ſaith he, *the Greeks neither Believe, nor impugne, Tranſubſtantiation. They believe it not; for it hath no place in the Doctrine of their Church. It is neither in the Confeſſions of their Faith; nor Deciſions of Councils, nor Liturgies*; [*i. e.* in ſuch Language, as he exacts. Surely, this main Point, the Manner of our Lords Preſence, is not omitted in all theſe: the *Conſtantinopolitan*, the ſecond *Nicene*, Council, the *Liturgies* ſpeak of it; Nor is Tranſubſtantiation impugned in them, according to Him: is clearly maintained by them, according to Catholicks] *They do not impugne it; For, as far as appears, they have not argued with the Latines, nor formally debated it with them in their former Diſputes.* Thus He. And, as he grants the Greeks not to have quarrelled with the *Latines*, becauſe they held Tranſubſtantiation, So † the Latines never to have accuſed the *Greeks*, as if they held it not. There ſeems therefore no great need of *Miſſions*, *diſtributing charities*, *teaching Schools* there, *&c.* to induce theſe Orientals to approve a Tenet, which they never formerly conteſted; and of an errour in which, though the main Point, theſe two Churches never accuſed one another: Nay, the Greeks, in ſome of their Confeſſions, as in that of the Venetian Greeks to the Cardinal of *Guiſe*, ſeem to have out-done the Latines; and to go beyond *Tranſubſtantiation*.

p. 375.

Mean-while

Mean-while, the great quarrels the ſame *Greeks* make with the *Latines* about ſmaller matters in this principal part of the Chriſtian Service, and the chief Subſtance of its Liturgies, the Euchariſt, as about the manner of the *Conſecration*; and about *Azymes*; and, on the other ſide, the great Storms, that have been raiſed between Catholicks and Proteſtants, from the very beginning of the Reformation, about this very Point of Tranſubſtantiation, do ſhew, that, if the difference between the *Greeks* and *Latines* were conſiderable and real herein, there could not have been, on both ſides ſuch a conſtant ſilence; Though in ſome other matters, of *little conſequence*, or, at leaſt, of *little evidence*, ſuch as M. *Claude* inſtanceth in, there can be ſhewed a ſilent toleration of the different Judgements, as well of *Churches*, as of *private* Perſons.

10ly. Hitherto, from §. 321. *n.* 11. I have reflected on M. *Claude's* Explication of the Greeks Opinion concerning *Tranſubſtantiation*. Now to view the other Point, *Adoration*. Here 1ſt. He denies not an *inferiour* and *Relative* Adoration to be allowed to be due, and paid by the Greeks, to the Holy Myſteries in the *Euchariſt*; ſuch as is given to the *Holy Goſpel*, and to other Sacred things. Of which we find in S. *Chryſoſtom's* Maſſe, that, before his reading the Goſpel, — *Diaconus reſpondet*. Amen. *& reverentiam Sancto Evangelio exhibet*. See M. *Claud's* laſt Anſwer, *l.* 3. *c.* 7. *p.* 219. where he grants; *That the Greeks have much Devotion for* Pictures; *for the* Evangile, *and for the* pain benit, *for the* Bread *of the* Euchariſt, *before the Conſecration*. 2ly. A *Supreme Adoration* he grants lawful, and due to our Lords Humanity wherever preſent; and allows ſuch an Adoration actually given, even by *Proteſtants*, at the time of their receiving the Euchariſt, to our Lord Chriſt, and to his Sacred Humanity, as in *Heaven*. And, to his Adverſary urging ſome places of the Fathers for the practice of Adoration in the Communion, he replies. — || *The Author deceives us, in proving what is not controverted. For the Queſtion is, not: whether in the Communion we ought to adore Jeſus Chriſt our Redeemer, and his Fleſh perſonally united to the Word, repreſented by the Sacrament: We practice it with an ardent, and humble Devotion, when we approach to the Holy Table.* And afterward, *Who doubts, but that the Body of Jeſus Chriſt is Soveraignly Adorable.* 3ly. He cannot but know, or elſe hath been very careleſs to inform himſelf, that no *Soveraign* Adoration is pretended either by the *Roman*, or *Greek* Church to be given to the external *Species*, or *Symboles*, of the Euchariſt,

§. 321. n. 22.

|| 2 *Reſp part.* 2. *c.* 8 *p.* 416.

(which they hold Venerable only with an inferiour cult, such as is due to all other Holy things,) but only to the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* contained under them: as the Council of *Trent*, allowing
|| *Sess.* 13. *c.* 6. the Expression of *adoring the Sacrament cultu Latriæ*, yet explains it in their Canon thus. || — *Si quis dixerit in Sancto Eucharistiæ*
† *De Euchar. l.* 4. *c.* 29. *Sacramento Christum, unigenitum Dei filium, non esse cultu Latriæ etiam externo adorandum, Anathema sit*: And, as *Bellarmin* † also resolves the state of the Controversie.—*Quicquid sit de modo loquendi; status quæstionis non est, nisi An Christus in Eucharistiâ sit adorandus cultu Latriæ.* 4ly. In the 4th. Observation precedent, M. *Claude* saith he will not contest the Greek's holding a *Real* Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, Though, he contends, it is not by the Roman way of *Transubstantiation*. Now from this Real Presence held by the Greeks even after that way he allows, at least, if he will but grant the true consequences thereof, mentioned before, §. 321. n. 13. *Viz.* An Hypostatical, or other, Union to this Body offered and distributed in the Eucharist, such as converts it into the Flesh of our Lord, and renders it the Body of the same Person, with that born of the Blessed Virgin; *non aliud ab eo, quod sumpsit in utero Virginis*; (By which she People seem sufficiently instructed not to distinguish, in their Mode of Adoration, between these two, that they are taught to be personally the same.) I say from such a Real Presence held by the Greeks a lawfulness of adoring Christs Body, as there present, must be held by them. And then; if it can be shewed by M. *Claude* they do not actually adore, it must be reckoned a matter of neglect; not, of Conscience, or denying such thing due.

5ly. But, now, to consider their *Practice*. He denies not the Greeks to adore, in their Mode of Adoration, (which is by inclining the *Head* and Body; seldom, *kneeling*,) when they receive the Communion; their Liturgies have it, often repeated; and, surely, he will allow them, herein, as much Devotion as he doth to the Protestants: and also them, to give at least an external *Relative* Devotion to the *Mysteries*, for such they give to the *Evangiles*: and, methinks, the witnesses he produceth. *p.* 216. should not, in general, denie simply, any Adoration of the Greeks at all. The Question, then, only is; granting already an external Adoration given by the Greeks, when they approach to the Communion; whether this, in their intention, be a *soveraign* Adoration exhibited to Christs Sacred *Divinity* & *Humanity*, as there present, Now; the Greek's holding this Humanity there really present, conceded before, seems sufficient to determine this, without

more

more ado. And, for one to pretend, that this Adoration of the Greeks is given only to God; or to Chriſts *Divinity* as every where preſent; or, to the *Humanity* united to it, but only this as in *Heaven*; and, not to it alſo as preſent in the Euchariſt, when the ſame Greeks confeſs it to be ſo; and, when the Euchariſtical preſence is the occaſion of ſuch their Adoration; here I ſay, not to allow the extent of their Adoration, ſo far as they believe the preſence of the Perſon adored; and their worſhip the ſame latitude, as their Faith, would be an unjuſt and groundleſs abridgement of their Devotions: as alſo this, to pretend an *interior*, or *relative*, Adoration given by them only to the Myſteries, where the ſame Communicants hold a *ſupreme* due to the *Perſon* Preſent with them.

To view a little the Form of their Liturgy. We read in S. *Chryſoſtom's* Maſſe: That the *Prieſt*, after Conſecration, and before he takes the Holy bread, to communicate himſelf with it, *adores*: and ſaith, — *Attende, Domine Jeſu Chriſte, de Sancto habitaculo tuo: veni ad ſanctificandum nos qui in excelſis cum Patre ſimul reſides, & hic unà nobiſcum inviſibiliter verſaris; & dignare potenti manu tuâ nobis impertiri immaculatum Corpus tuum, & pretioſum ſanguinem; & per nos, toti Populo. Corpus tuum.* I add, never ſevered from thy Divinity, and thy ſelf. To whom alſo the Prieſt had ſaid before in the begining of the Service. — *Tu enim es, qui offers & offerris; aſſumis, & diſtribueris, Chriſte Deus noſter.* Then the Prieſt *adores* again, and ſaith thrice to himſelf, — *Deus propitius eſto mihi Peccatori;* An Act of Humiliation uſed here by him, before he takes the *Sancta* into his hands for the Communion, as it was once before, at the begining of the Oblation. And ſo, ſaith the Rubrick, all the People *adore* with him. — *Populus ſimiliter cunctus cum devotione adorat.* Then he takes the *Holy Bread*, and makes the *Elevation* of it, yet *whole*, and entire; ſaying, *Sancta Sanctis*; And the Quire anſwers, with relation to It yet one, and entire, — *Unus Sanctus, Unus Dominus, Jeſus Chriſtus.* Then the Prieſt, breaking it into 4. Pieces, ſaith. — *Frangitur Agnus Dei; qui frangitur, at non comminuitur: qui ſemper comeditur, & non conſumitur;* [which ſhews, what *Agnus Dei*, whether this in *Heaven*, or preſent *here*, is now ſpoken of, and thus adored.] *Sed eos, qui ſunt participes, ſanctificat.* So taking a piece thereof in his hand, and preparing himſelf to receive it, he ſaith, — *Credo Domine & confiteor, Quòd Tu es Chriſtus*, &c. — *Dignare in præſepe anima mea ἀλόγυ, & in coinquinatum meum Corpus ingredi — & dignare me participem effici ſanctiſſimi tui Corporis & Sanguinis.* [I add never ſevered from thy Divinity, and thy ſelf.] Alſo, when he calls the Deacon, to communicate him with the Holy Bread: 'tis ſaid, — *Accedens Diaconus* Reverentiam exhibet. And ſo alſo before receiving the Chalice. It is ſaid again, — *Diaconus venit, & adorat ſemel, dicens: Ecce venio ad immortalem Regem*, &c. Where it muſt be remembred, that the Greeks alſo held, the Body of our Lord that is received in the Euchariſt, to be *immortal*, and *incorruptible*. This we find in their *Liturgy*. And, ſuitable to this, we read, in *Cabaſilas*† (expounding the Liturgy,) concerning the People before their communicating. — *Ipſi autem* (ſaith he) *fidem attendentes, & adorant, & benedicunt, & Jeſum, qui in eis* [donis Sanctificatis] *intelligitur,*

† c. 39.

314 *intelligitur*, [oppos'd to *videtur*] *ut Deum, celebrant*; Where M. *Claud's* note is † ' that — *Non adorant dona, ſed Jeſum.* But who ſaith, that a
† l. 3. c. 7 p. 322. Soveraign Adoration is due, or given, to the *Dona*? Again ' *Jeſum*, (ſaith he) *qui intelligitur*, i. e. only, *qui repreſentatur in Donis.* But all the former Expreſſions, implying our Lords preſence, ſhew their belief to be contrary. *Tu es*, (ſaid the Prieſt before) *qui offers, & offerris: aſſumis & diſtribueris, Chriſte Deus noſter.* And the People, after this adoring, in their receiving, ſay. — *Benedictus, qui venit in nomine Domini*, of which, the ſame *Cabaſilas*, — *Tanquam nunc ad eos venientem, & apparentem, Chriſtum benedicunt* Who alſo before (*c.* 24.) intimates the cuſtom of the Greeks, in the Service *adorare, & alloqui corpus & ſanguinem Domini.* Now I ſay, All theſe Paſſages in the Greek Liturgy well conſidered; Here for one to grant, the *Real* and *corporal* Preſence of our Lord in his whole Perſon in the Holy Myſteries to be believed by this Prieſt, Deacon, and other Communicants, and yet to ſay, their Adoration, and other Addreſſes and Allocutions are not given and made to him, as there preſent; but to him, only as in Heaven; or only to his Divinity as there, and every where preſent, abſtracted from his Humanity, is ſuch a Comment upon this Liturgie, as nothing but a ſtrong pre-ingagement can force upon any ones judgement.

§. 321. n 23. † l. 3. c. 7. p. 216. The Teſtimonies, this Author brings, † do accuſe the Greeks of ſome neglect in this Duty, but do not ſhew them to juſtifie it; and theſe very Perſons, that cenſure ſuch neglect toward the Holy Myſteries after Conſecrated, accuſe them almoſt of committing Idolatry toward them before. So that it ſeems rather ſome defect, of knowledge, in ſuch, concerning the Ceremonies of Conſecration, than want of Devotion. *Cabaſilas* †, long ago, obſerved the ſame in ſome ignorant People, and † *c* 24. blamed it: but yet, in the ſame place, allows the Adoration of, and Allocutions made to, the Body and Blood of our Lord, when the Offerings are Sacrificed, and perfected. The Conſecration alſo of the Greeks being longer extended, and the Adoration not ſo unitedly performed preſently upon the pronouncing of our Lords words of Inſtitution, as amongſt the Latines; but, disjunctively, at their communicating, might occaſion ſome miſtake in thoſe Latines, who accuſed them of a Non-Adoration. So, the other irreverences and indecencies, objected, are to be eſteemed, only negligences in private practice; not, conſequences of the publick Doctrine; nor countenanced by their Liturgies. Which Liturgies uſe as much Ceremony towads the Holy Myſteries, as the Roman doth; Where alſo, firſt, the Remains of the *Holy Bread* are carefully put into the Chalice, for the People to be *communicated* therewith; and then, for the *Remains*, after the Communion conſummated. — *Sacerdos* (ſaith the Rubrick) *quod reſiduum eſt Communionis in Sancto Calice, cum attentione, & devotione conſumit, & ter S. Calicem abluit, & attendit, ne remaneat particula, Margarita vocata* [not the leaſt crum of the intinct Hoſt]

As for ſeveral Devotions and Honours performed to the *Bleſſed Sacrament*, here in the Weſt, (which this perſon diligently reckons up, much to its praiſe,) not ſo in the Eaſt; (frequently urged by M. *Claude*,

as

as good Arguments of the Greek Church not believing Tranſubſtantiation, or ſuch a Real Preſence, as the Roman,) and, in latter times here more, than in the former. 1ſt. they are held no ſuch neceſſary circumſtances, or conſequences, without the which a Real Preſence may not be believed, and a due Adoration, (in ſome convenient manner or other,) practiſed 2ly. The occaſion of them is well known to have been the *Berengarian*, and many other, Errors concerning the Euchariſt: which appeared here in the *Weſt*, but diſturbed not the *Eaſt*. Which Errors, interr ng many *Indignities* and affronts to this richeſt, and deareſt Legacy of our departing Lord, cauſed the Church to multiply alſo the external teſtifications of her *Devotion*, *Gratitude*, and *Reverence*, to it; and Gods wiſdom, as uſually, out of ſuch viliſyings, and diſreſpects, extracted a greater Honour, as to External Ceremony, to theſe High Myſteries. So alſo the many ſubtle Queſtions, that have been diſcuſſed and ſtated among the Latines, not ſo much thought on by the Greeks, but all ſhut up in a *Quo modo novit Deus*, (another frequent Argument with this Author, of the Greeks not believing Tranſubſtantiation) acknowledge the ſame Original, *viz.* the Provocations, Objections, contrary falſe poſitions, of the Heterodox, Which forced the Church to deſcend to the ſame particulars with them; Nor could ſhe cenſure theſe as Errours, without eſtabliſhing their Contradictories, as *Truth*. This of Adoration. § 321 n. 24.

To conclude. The many Conceſſions of M. *Claude*, and the Conſequences of them, forementioned, ſeem to me ſufficient, 1ſt. to *diſſwade* any ſober and modeſt perſon, who relies not on his own judgment for the controverted ſenſe of Holy Scriptures, but holds it a ſafer way to conform to that of Church-Authority, to diſſwade him. I ſay, from any ſuch Communion, as he ſees, by the former Account, oppoſed both by the *Latines* and the *Greeks*; *Greeks*, preſent, or paſt, as high as *Damaſcen*, in the 8th. age, and may not I ſay as high as *Gregory Nyſſen*. † in the 4th. whilſt both theſe Latines and Greeks hold a Real, or Corporal preſence of our Lord in the Euchariſt, and agree in a literal ſence of *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*. Nor will M. *Claude* enter with his Adverſary into this Controverſie. 2. Next; to *perſwade* him, of the two, rather to the *Roman* Communion: as whoſe *Tranſubſtantiation*, beſides that it hath been eſtabliſhed by ſo many Councils †, is of it ſelf much more credible, and more accommodated to the Scripture-expreſſions, then I know not what Augmentation of Chriſts natural Body, born of the Bleſſed Virgin, by a new Breaden one aſſumed in the Euchariſt, numerically diſtinct from the other; yet, by the like aſſumption, and Union to our Lords Divinity, rendred perſonally one and the ſame Body with it. But much more will be confirmed in the ſame Reſolution, if, by what hath been ſaid above, † he diſcerns M *Claud's* Relation of the Modern *Greek* opinion unſound; and that the main Body of them (except perhaps ſome few *Impanatiſts*, that have been there, as alſo in the Weſtern Church,) in holding a total ſubſtantial change of the Bread, have accorded with the *Roman* Church.

† *See before* §. 321. n. 14.

† See the *guide in Controverſy. Diſc.* 1. §. 57, 58.

† §. 321. n. 16 &c.

§.321. n.25 I hope the Reader will pardon this digreſſion, the rather, becauſe,
† §.321. n.1 it ſerves much to illuſtrate that, whereof I was diſcourſing, † That, (notwithſtanding whatever evidence of Truth,) Anſwers, and Replyes, from Perſons ingenious, and pre-ingaged, find no end; and that, when *Controverſies* are, by one of the contending parties, *denyed* any Deciſive Judge; though error may eaſily be *overcome*, yet it can hardly be *ſilenc'd*. For as God, for the greater tryal of our obedience, hath permitted in the world not only *Evil*, but very many *allurements* alſo, and enticements, to it; ſo, not only *Errors*, but many *veriſimilities*, and appearances of Reaſon, ever ready to ſupport it, with thoſe, that do not by Humility attain the illuminations of his Grace. *Evidence* ſufficient God hath left always to clear, and manifeſt all neceſſary Truth to thoſe, who are of an obedient Spirit, and willing to learn it: But not ſufficient to force (like the Mathematicks) the Underſtandings of the ſelf-confident, and intereſted to gain-ſay it; But that they may have ſome fair colour or other, to oppoſe to it, and catch the credulous.

§.321. n.26 All which ſtill more infers the great neceſſity of *Church-Authority*,
† §.321. n.10 and a conformity to it, and the reaſonableneſs of *Monſieur Mainbourg's* Method for reducing *Proteſtants* to the true Faith, viz. — *That matters, once decided by this Authority, ſhould be no longer diſputed*; A Rule, the Proteſtants, *i. e.* the more *potent* Party of them, for preſerving their own peace, would have to be obſerved in the *Differences* among themſelves, (ſhewed in the proceedings of the Synod at *Dort*, of which ſee before §.254. n.2.) but not, in thoſe between them and Roman Catholicks, becauſe here they are the *weaker*. To whom M. *Claud's* anſwer in the Preface of his laſt Reply to D. *Arnaud*, is this.— *It is unjuſt* (ſaith he,) *that he will have the Deciſions of Councils to be Preſcriptions againſt us* [the Proteſtants;] *not remembring, that nothing can preſcribe againſt Truth, eſpecially when it concerns our Salvation. And, the Determinations of Councils not being with us of any Conſideration but as they do conform to the Holy Scriptures, and to the Principles of Chriſtian Religion, we cannot have from hence any reaſonable or profitable way to end the particular differences that divide us, but only this, to examine the matter to the bottom, to diſcern whether ſuch conformity* [*i.e.* of the Councils to the Scriptures,] *which we ſuppoſe neceſſary, is; or, is not.*

To which he adds there, as alſo frequently elſewhere: That the ſhorteſt, and ſureſt, and only right, way for ſettling the Conſcience in repoſe, (which muſt reſt its Faith immediately on Gods word & Divine Revelation, is, for both Parties to proceed to the Trial of their cauſe, all other Authoritie and Methods laid aſide, by the *Holy Scriptures*. And, when he is preſſed by his Adverſary; That, in theſe Controverſies, at leaſt all perſons doubting, *i. e.* what is the true ſence, of the *Scriptures* controverted, and of *Antiquity* expounding them, and not certain of the contrary of what the Church teacheth concerning them, (as all *unlearned* Proteſtants muſt be,) ought, herein, to conform, and adhere rather to the Church, than to Separatiſts, he ſeeks to decline it thus: That the ſimpleſt perſon may receive ſufficient

ſufficient certainty from the *clearneſs* of *Scripture*, in all matters *neceſſary*; that, from theſe Scriptures learning *what he ought to believe*, he may eaſily know alſo, whether the *ſociety*, he lives in, be a true Church, and ſuch as will conduct him to Salvation; that hence he needs not trouble himſelf with Controverſie, touching what the *former Church* hath *believed*; Yet that, our Lord promiſing to be with true Believers to the end of the world, ſo as they ſhall not fall into damnable error, Charity obligeth him, (without his reading them,) to believe, that the Fathers are of this number; and ſo, believed, as they ought; and ſo, were of his Faith. To give you his own words. *l.* 1. *c.* 4. — *The word of God*, (ſaith he) *contains purely, and clearly, all that, which is neceſſary to form our Faith, to regulate our Worſhip, and Manners. And, God aſſiſting us with his Grace, it is eaſie for the moſt ſimple to judge, whether the Miniſtery, under which we live, can conduct us to ſalvation: and conſequently, whether our ſociety is a true Church. For, for this, he needs only examine It as to theſe two Characters. One, if they teach all the things clearly contain'd in God's word; and the other, if they teach nothing, beſides, that is contrary to thoſe things, or doth corrupt the efficacy, and force of them.* And afterward.—*This Examen*, (ſaith he,) *is ſhort, eaſy, and proportion'd to the capacity of all the world: and, it forms a judgment as certain, as if one had diſcuſſed all the Controverſies one after another.* Again l. 1. c. 5.—*There are two Queſtions: One, touching what we ought to believe on the matter of the Euchariſt. The other, touching what hath been believed by the ancient Church, The firſt of theſe cleared, we need not trouble our ſelves about the* 2d. *Now, as for thoſe of our Communion, the firſt Queſtion is cleared by the word of God.* And for the 2d. he reſolves it thus, *l.* 1. *c.* 6:— *That the Promiſes of* J. *Chriſt aſſure us, that he will be with true Believers to the end of the world.* Whence he concludes,—*that there hath always been a number of true Believers, whoſe Faith hath never been corrupted by damnable Errors.* Then,—*that charity obligeth us to believe, that the Fathers were of this number.* And then laſtly, *We knowing from Scripture what we ought to believe in this Point, we alſo are confirmed, without ſtudying them, that the Fathers believed the ſame.*

Now to reflect briefly on what he hath ſaid in the order it lies here. *A Council* (ſaith he) *cannot preſcribe againſt Truth.* True. But the *Council* is brought in for a Judg, where a diſpute & Queſtion is: what, or, on what ſide, is the *Truth*. *The determinations of Councils are not with us of any conſideration, but as they do conform to the H Scroptures.* Right. But the Council is call'd in for a Judg, where a doubt and diſpute is; what, or on what ſide, is the true *ſence* of ſuch, and ſuch, *Scriptures*. Where, if he meaneth; that they refuſe to ſubmit to a Council unleſſe conforming to Scripture, as the *ſence* of Scripture is given by the Council, that is it we deſire: for the Council will ſtill profeſs its following the ſence of Script: if, as this ſence underſtood by the Proteſtants, what is this, but to ſay they will ſubmit to the Judgment, or Deciſion, of a Council, ſo often as it ſhall agree with their own? *The only reaſonable and profitable way to end differences, is this, to examine the matter to the bottom*; i.e. whether the Deciſions of the Coun-

cil conform with H. Scripture. But, when this is done, How will the Difference end? Will not the Controverſie, as the Replies multiply, ſwell rather ſtill bigger; as his, and D. *Arnaud's* doth? *Search to the bottom*; Suppoſe a *Socinian* ſhould ſay this, againſt the former Church-deciſions, concerning the *Trinity, the ſupreme Deity of the Son, and H. Ghoſt; Gods eſſential Omnipreſence, his abſolute preſcience of future Contingents*, &c. will Proteſtants ſay, he makes a rational motion? Then, how can any Proteſtant reſt his Faith in *theſe* Points upon the Authority of the *Councils*, and their *Creeds*? will you ſay, he doth not? but, on the Scriptures. Have they then ſearched all theſe Points *to the bottom* there; compared the particular Scriptures urged by the *Socinian*, and thoſe urged againſt him; and weighed them in the Ballance? If, yet, they have not, ought they? If they ought; what a task here for young Proteſtant-ſtudents? what an Eternal Diſtraction in this, [*a ſearch!*] what heavenly peace, in the other [*obedience to the judgements of former Councils;*] and Vacancy for better imployments! Again. If they ought: what, *all* Proteſtants? the moſt of them, as of all Chriſtians, are illiterate Men, not having either leiſure, or ability, to ſearch, *&c.* Muſt theſe adhere, therefore, to former *Councils*, and their *Creeds*, in *theſe* Points? Then in *others*; and in this of *Real Preſence*, or *Tranſubſtantiation*; and ſo they remain no longer on M. *Claud's party*. Or will he bind them to ſubmit their judgement to ſome *inferior* Eccleſiaſtical Authority, or Miniſtry, ſtanding in oppoſition to a *ſuperior*? But this is *Schiſm* in them both: and juſtly is ſuch perſon ruin'd in his credulity to one authority uſurp'd, for his denying it to another, to whom it is due; Nor would M *Claude* be well pleaſed, if any one ſhould follow ſome few reformed Miniſters, divided from the reſt of their Conſiſtory, Claſs, or Synod.

§. 321. n. 26. As for the *Tryal*, he motions, to be made by H. *Scriptures*. This is a thing that hath been by the 2. Parties already done, *firſt*; as it ought. And the iſſue of it was; That one Party underſtood theſe Scriptures in one ſence, the other in another; For Example. The one underſtood, *Hoc eſt Corpus meum, literally*: the other in a *Metaphor*, and ſo differently underſtood alſo all the *other* Texts of Scripture produced in this Cauſe. Here, the true *ſence* of Scripture, became the *Queſtion*, and their Controverſie. For the Judge and Decider of this between them, when time was, they took a *Council*: For, ſince Scripture they cou'd no more take, the ſence of that being their Queſtion, to whom ſhou'd they repair, but the *Church*? and of the Church a Council is the *Repreſentative*. Councils, ſeveral, to a great number, in ſeveral ages†, decided this matter, & declared the ſence of the Scriptures; but ſo, as it liked not one Party. Theſe therefore thought fit to remove the *Tryal* from thence to the more Venerable Sentence of the *Fathers*, and *Primitive Church*; *i.e.* of their *writings* Again, the *ſence* of theſe *writings* as, before, that of *Scriptures*, is underſtood diverſly by the Conteſters; And now the true *ſence* of the writings of the Fathers is the *Queſtion*, and Controverſie. Nor, here will *Diſputes* end it; Witneſs ſo many Replies made on either ſide. *Former Councils*, as they have given

† See *Guide in Controver. Diſc.* 1. §. 57 58.

ven their Judgement of the Sence of the writings of H Scriptures, ſo they have of thoſe of the Fathers, but their Authority is rejected, in both; And, a *new Council*, were it now convened, beſides that M. *Claud*'s Party, being the fewer, and, ſo, eaſily over-voted, would never ſubmit to it, we may, from M. *Claud*'s Confeſſion†, — *That both Greeks and Latines are far departed from the Evangelical ſimplicity, and the natural explication that the Ancients have given to the Myſtery of the Euchariſt*, rationally conjecture that Proteſtants, in ſuch Councils, would remain the party condemn'd. What, then, would this perſon have? He would have the Controverſy begin again, and return to the Scriptures. Which is, in plain Language: That, the *Queſtion* ſhould decide the *Controverſie*: and, till this can do it, That, ſo long as the Proteſtants are the *weaker* Party, all ſhould have their Liberty. For, when they are the *ſtronger*, they do well diſcern the neceſſity of Synods for ending ſuch Differences; and, though not profeſſing themſelves infallible, yet, upon the Evangelical promiſe of our Lords aſſiſtance to ſuch Councils, think fit to require all the Clergy under their Jurisdiction, upon pain of Suſpenſion from their Function, to receive and Subſcribe their *Decrees* for *God's Truth*; and to teach them to the People, as ſuch; and think fit to *Excommunicate* thoſe teaching the contrary, till they ſhall recant their Errour. Of which ſee before §. 200. Witneſs ſuch carriage of the *Synod* of *Dort* toward the *Remonſtrants*, who challenged the ſame exemption from their Tribunal, as they had done from that of *Trent*; but could not be heard.

† l. 3. c. 13 p. 337.

As for that which follows, in *Anſwer* to D. *Arnaud*'s moſt rational challenging a Submiſſion, and Conformity, of ſo many Proteſtants, as have no certainty of their new Opinions, rather to the Church, than to Innovators, to me it ſounds thus. That every plain, and ſimple Proteſtant, 1ſt. thinks his *Expoſition* or *ſence* of *Scripture*, in this Point of the Euchariſt, and ſo in others, any way neceſſary, to be *clear*, and without diſpute, [*and the more ſimple he is, the ſooner he may think ſo; becauſe he is not able to compare all other Texts, nor to examine the contrary ſences given by others, or the reaſonable grounds thereof.*] 2. Next, that every one, who thinks his Expoſition, or Sence of Scripture clear in ſuch Point, is by this ſufficiently *aſſured*, that he hath a *right* Faith; or, from this *ſence* of his, knows *what he ought to believe, and forms a Judgement* herein *as certain, as if one had diſcuſſed all the Controverſies, one after another*: [a ſtrange propoſition; but *I* ſee nothing elſe, from which ſuch perſon collects his faith to be right; if any doth, produce it] 3ly. That every ſuch ſimple perſon now eaſily knows, whether the Society, where in he lives, be a true Church, or otherwiſe, *viz.* as they agree with, or diſſent from, that *right Faith* of his, already ſuppoſed; or as he finds them *to teach the things clearly contained in God's word, i. e.* in his clear Sence thereof. 4ly. Knowing thus, from this his clear expoſition, or ſence of Scripture, what he ought to believe, he needs not trouble himſelf, what the Ancient Church hath believed; [*which is very true:*] nay, he knows, without reading them, or M. *Arnaud*'s and *Claud*'s diſcourſes upon them, that the Fathers, if of the number of the Faithful, were of his Opinion, by M. *Claud*'s arguing foremen tioned. I deſire the Reader to review his words, or, the 5th & 6th Chapters

1.

2.

3.

4.

of

of his 1ſt. Book, and ſee if he can make any better conſtruction of them. Now, if there be any Sence in this, he ſaith; How can he hinder, but that a ſimple Catholick may uſe the ſelf-ſame Plea (Church-authority being laid aſide) for a certainty of his Faith upon the ſame pretenſions, viz. *his clear ſence* of *Scripture*, quite contrary to the Proteſtants clear ſence? And, in any Controverſie amongſt Proteſtants: (Suppoſe that of the Remonſtrants and Anti-Remonſtrants,) here both ſides have the ſame Plea, one againſt another; namely, the certainty of their Faith from their own Sence of the Scriptures controverted between them. And, why doth not this certainty void their Synods? For M. *Claude* ſaith, — *The word of God contains nettement & clairement, all that which is neceſſary to form our Faith, and that the moſt ſimple are capable to judge of it*, &c. Unleſs the Proteſtant Controverſies be never about any thing *neceſſary*. This is the way M. *Claude* thought on to leave no *Doubters*, though never ſo unlearned, among Proteſtants, as to the Euchariſt, or other Points of their Faith. But mean while, if, after ſuch Speculations of his, any ſuch *Doubters* there be, I do not find, but that he leaves ſo many wholly to D. *Arnaud's* diſpoſal, *viz.* that they return to, and remain in, the boſom of the former Church ſo long, till they become certain of its errors; and not follow ſtrangers that have not entered by the dore, into Chriſt's Fold; and, I hope, they will conſider it. As for the *ſettling* of our *Conſcience* this perſon ſpeaks of, by reſting our *Faith immediately* on *Gods Word*, I ſee not, where the *ſence* of the Scriptures is ſuppoſed the thing *controverted*, how any one reſts his Faith more immediately on *God's word* by following *his own* Expoſition or Sence thereof, or the Expoſition of a *Miniſter*, &c. (for ſome perſon's expoſition he muſt follow,) than he, that follows that of the *Church*.

If we are, then, for *a total application to the Scriptures*, and for *ſearching things to the bottom*; Let us ſearch there firſt this main Point, (that decides all other) concerning our *Lord's* eſtabliſhing a *juſt Church-Authority* for ending contentions. Where we ſhall find alſo; *that he is not a God of diſſention*, or
1 *Cor.* 14. 33 Confuſion, in his Houſe, the Church; *but of Peace*. And — *That he hath*
Eph. 4. 11, 14 *given his Clergy* in a certain Subordination, *that we ſhould not be carryed about*
1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *with every wind of Doctrine*; as we muſt be, when ever theſe diſagree in expounding Scripture to us, if we have no Rule, which of them to follow. The truth of this, once found out by our ſearch, will ſave many other *ſearches*; of which, without it, I ſee no end. In vain do we endeavour, with whatever pains, to diſcern Gods Truth without the illumination of his Holy *Spirit* and *Grace*; and ſince, *revelat parvulis*, in vain expect this, without great *Humility*, and ſelf-diſeſteem, and a reverent preference of, and pious Credulity toward our juſt, and lawful Spiritual Superiours. — *Credendo*, firſt,
† *c.* 1. [i. e. *Eccleſiæ*] ſaith S. *Auſtin* in his Tract *De utilitate Credendi* †, *præmunimur, & illuminatur præparamur Deo*.

§ 321. n. 27. To reſume then here the matter we were ſpeaking of before, §. 321. n. 1. from which we have ſo long digreſſed. For ſuch Perſons, as are ſelf-confident, deſpiſers of Superiors, much pre-engaged, whatever evident Teſtimony Truth may have on its ſide, I can affirm nothing, For Pride, and thinking they ſee utterly puts out their eyes. But I think, ſo many as are no way

thus

thus intangled, and are humble, and well affected to Authority, will by reading the pieces aforesaid, be reduced either to a full perswasion on the *Churches* side in this great Point; or to a *Dubitancy* and *uncertainty* of that, which is maintained against it. And then, this later only (as hath been shewed †) is a sufficient Ground, and Inductive of their conformity to it, I mean, to the *authority* of the *present Church*, ☒ † §. 191. &c.

In this point, then, the main *Trial* seems to be 1. Whether *Antiquity* indeed so understood, and *Councils* declared, the *sense* of these Scriptures, as is pretended. Since, as Mr. *Thorndike* hath it; in his Rule of Reformation, † this is to be taken for granted,—*That nothing can be the true sence of Scripture, which the consent of the whole Church contradicteth.* 2. If this found so; whether this *Authority* ought not to prescribe to any particular judgment; especially when he perceives, the new pretended *Demonstrations* to the contrary no way to perswade this present *Church-Authority*, as any true Demonstration (in the Protestants Definition of it) necessarily must. † *Forbear. and Penalties, c.* 8.

For the Second Point, *Invocation of Saints*.

1. It is granted by *Protestants*; that if the Saints *deceased* hear, or otherwise know, our requests made to them, it is lawful to invocate them, or desire their prayers for us, as we do those of Saints *here*; and the invocation of them in any other manner *Catholicks* disclaim. §. 322. *n.* 1.

2. It sufficiently appears, from the knowledge of things done, || or said, † in absence, that several *Prophets*, and other *Saints* of God, by *Revelation*, or *Vision*, have had here in this life, that it is possible; that the Saints glorified, without imagining any their *omni-presence* or *omni-science*, may know, by the like *Revelation*, *Representation*, or *Vision*, or by some other way as God pleaseth, (for the *particular* manner thereof is no way stated by the *Church*) may, thus, know, I say, either *all*, or *so many* of those prayers, that are made to them (though at the *same* time, by *several* persons, in the most *distant* places) as it may concern their Petitioners, touching any benefit to be received by their Intercessions, that they should know them. Lastly, possible, that the Saints Glorified may know these, or some other instrument of God's mercy, *viz.* Angels, know these for them, or in their stead (for this clause also is put in by St. *Austin*, proceeding most cautiously in this matter.) These things, I say, are possible; And if any of these be put it is abundantly sufficient to render *Invocation* of || *King.* 5 25. — *Act.* 5. 3. — *Col.* 2. 5. † 2 *King.* 6. 8, 9, 12, 31, 32.

Saints glorified not vain. For, to fruſtrate the benefit hereof, the *Saints* muſt neither know, nor *others* for them; who, only upon their general Interceſſions offered, may be, as God pleaſeth, made his inſtruments in relieving the neceſſities of ſuch Supplicants. They muſt neither know *all*, nor *any* of our affairs or prayers: For if they, or others for them, only know and relieve ſome, it will be lawful, at any time, in any thing, to implore their help, who, we know not, but in that time, and thing, they may aſſiſt us. Again, ſuppoſe, neither the Saints, nor others for them, ſave God only, to know at all our particular prayers, or wants; but the Saints, only *in groſſe*, to intercede for all thoſe, that implore their help; or, yet more generally, only for all their fellow-members here, that are in diſtreſs, whether imploring, or not imploring, their help; yet, if God, at leaſt, apply the benefit of any Saints general Interceſſions more particularly to thoſe, who more particularly honour, and, with their addreſſes, ſollicite ſuch a Saint; Such *Invocation*, and *Honour* ſtill remains *profitable*, and advantageous to the Supplicant.

§. 322. n. 2. Where note, that neither thoſe, who make, nor yet God who reveales, their prayers to the Saints, do it at all for this end, that ſo the Saints may *make known* ſuch their prayers to *God*: (a thing in which Proteſtants pleaſe themſelves to find abſurdities and contradiction;) but, that theſe nearer *favourites* of *God*, and more powerful with him, may *obtain* from him (who knows all our prayers before we think them) the *grant* of thoſe requeſts, which great *ſinners* many times cannot. And out of *great mercy* to the Supplicants it is, that God *manifeſts* ſuch their prayers to the Saints: much what ſo, as he vouchſafed to direct *Jobs* three Friends to make their addreſſes to his Servant *Job*, to pray to Him for them, that ſo he might pardon them; becauſe *Him he* † *Job* 42. 8. *would accept.* † Or, as he ſpake to King *Abimeleck*, † whom he † *Gen.* 20. 7. had ſmitten, that he ſhould procure his Servant *Abrahams prayers*, to Him, that ſo he might heal him; for, how little will it differ from this, had God *revealed* to *Abraham* himſelf *Abimilecks* neceſſities, and willed him to *pray for* him; that ſo, upon his *interceſſions*, he might heal him? So *God reveals Saul's* prayers to *Ananias*, *Act.* 9. 11. And *Cornelius* his, to *Peter*, *Act.* 10. 19. both, in order to their aſſiſting them. And why may not God *manifeſt* to his *Saints* the *neceſſities* of others, that, by thus occaſioning their *Interceſſions*, he may relieve them, as well, as *manifeſt* to his Saints the *impenitency* of others, and ſo prohibit ſuch their *Interceſſions*, that he may puniſh them? As we find God † *Exod* 32. 9 ſpeaking to *Moſes*, —*Let me alone that mine anger may wax hot*,

bot, &c." And to the Prophet *Jeremy* † —*Pray not thou for this people, neither make interceſsion to me, for I will not hear thee.* This to ſhew, that there is no *abſurdity* in the former *poſſibilities.*

† *Jer.* 7. 16.

Sufficient, I ſaid, were any of the wales above-mentioned (and all *poſsible* enough) to render the ſupplicating of Saints deceaſed *not vain*. And ſo alſo, in *obtaining* the *benefit*, and *effect* of ſuch ſupplications, it cannot be denied *poſsible*; that the Saint, that obtains it, may be alſo the Inſtrument in conveighing it (and what *de facto* is done, I meddle not;) but yet this thing is no way *neceſſary*; no not, when the Supplicant, in any ſuch ſupernatural effect, ſees their *appearance*, or hears the ſound of their *voice*. For ſuch *Apparition* was that of *Ananias*, *Act.* 9. 12, who appeared, and ſpake to, and laid his hand on, S. *Paul* in a *viſion*, when himſelf knew nothing of it. And ſuch that of S. *Auſtin* † to *Paul* the trembling youth, and his ſiſter; and they hereby admoniſhed, that they ſhould repair to *Hippo*, where S. *Auſtin* was Biſhop, for their Cure; where alſo both of them miraculouſly received it; and yet St. *Auſtin* ſaith † —*Apparuit illis, neſciens. Illi enim me videbant, & ego neſciebam: & admonebantur, ut ad iſtam civitatem venirent.* And ſuch alſo his *appearance* to *Curma* (in that his ſtrange *extaſie* and peregrination out of his Body) ſeeming to baptize him; when he far diſtant (as he ſaith †) and buſied in other affairs. And ſuch that of S. *Ambroſe* (at the diſcovery of the *Bodies* of the Martyrs, *Gervaſius* and *Protaſius*) his torturing of the Devils, who publickly confeſſed it, and beg'd his forbearance, —*Illo aliud agente, atque hoc, cum ageretur, omnino neſciente*, as S. *Auſtin*, then himſelf at *Millan*, relates it. † Such *preſence*, or *inſtrumency* of the Saint ſupplicated to is not neceſſary for ſuch effect; but it is ſufficient, if this be done by the more ordinary, miniſtry of Angels: (And theſe, perhaps, ſometimes repreſenting the likeneſs of ſuch Saints,) or yet ſome other way, God pleaſeth. And therefore may ſuch appearances of a Saint be made, at the *ſame* time, in many places, without affirming the Saints preſence in *all*, or *any*, of them. This therefore in the ſecond place, I preſume to be put out of diſpute, that all thoſe things, that are *neceſſary* any way to render the *Invocation* of *Saints* glorified beneficial to their clients, are *poſsible*: Poſſible, that they, or ſome other Inſtrument of the Divine Mercy for them, may hear, or otherwiſe know, our prayers; and may effect, or procure, the relief of our wants.

§. 322. *n.* 3.

& without effect.

† *De Diverſ. Serm.* 31, 32. and *De Civ. Dei. l.* 22. *c.* 8.

† *Ibid.*

† *De Cura pro mort. c.* 12.

† *De Cura pro mort. c.* 17.

3. So that Thirdly. The only Queſtion here is: Whether they, or ſome for them, *actually do ſo*: Becauſe ſo generel a practice

§. 322. *n.* 4.

practice may ſeem too raſhly grounded upon a bare *poſsibility*. Now this latter Catholicks affirm, from the much *experience*, that the Church in all ages hath had of ſuch their prayers, being frequently anſwered with *ſupernatural*, and *miraculous* effects. And it will be hard for any Proteſtant to deny this, who will take the pains to look into the *Eccleſiaſtical* Hiſtories, or only to read over the 8*th* Chapter of S. *Auſtin's* 22 Book *de Civitate Dei*, and *Serm. De Diverſis*, 31, 32.

In this *Point* then, the main *Trial* ſeems to be, concerning the pretended *experience* whether not *falſified?* Which Falſification, that Proteſtant would ſeem to have an hard forehead that would undertake to demonſtrate, * againſt what occurs in all former *Church-Hiſtory*, Ancient, Modern (and theſe ſo uniform, and like one another, both in the Devotions uſed, and favours received; no ſtranger relations in the latter, than the former; and theſe in both many times witneſſed beyond all exception) Or even * againſt thoſe particular relations only, fore mentioned, in S. *Auſtin*.

§. 323. n. 1. For the Third Point: *Veneration of Images*. 1. The *uſe of* theſe *Images Proteſtants* allow: Nor, theſe to be removed for every abuſe of, or ſcandal taken at, them (which Puritans do at theirs) 2. For the *Veneration* of them; The Churches *Councils* have ſtated, That no *Latria* or Divine Worſhip may be given to any *Images*: but only ſuch an inferior honour, and reſpect (and that too meerly for the Exemplars ſake) as to other *ſacred utenſils*, and alſo to the *name* of *Jeſus* (at the laſt of which, when read, or heard, Proteſtants alſo bow.) The *Council* of *Trent* (diſpatching this Article concerning Images, as alſo ſome others, in ſome haſt, ſo to conclude the Council before the much feared death of the Pope then dangerouſly ſick) refers us to the more full Declaration of the *Second Council of* Nice, where this matter had beed much examined. Now the *Definition* of that *Council* runs thus,—*Definimus venerandas, & S. Imagines dedicandas, & in Templis Sanctis* Dei *collocandas, habendaſque: Quo ſcilicet, per hanc imaginum pictarum inſpectionem, omnes, qui contemplantur, ad Prototyporum memoriam, & recordationem, & deſiderium, veniant* [this for the lawful uſe of them.] *Illisq; ſalutationem, & honorariam adorationem, exhibeant: Non ſecundum fidem noſtram* [or, ſicut fides noſtra eſt] *veram latriam; quæ ſolum Divinæ naturæ competit; ſed, quemadmodum typo venerandæ, & vivificantis Crucis, & ſanctis Evangeliis, & reliquis ſacris, oblationibus ſuffitorum, & luminarium, reverenter accedimus.* [Which laſt was then the

the general practice, as well of the Iconoclaſts, as the Catholicks, nor any Controverſie in thoſe daies concerning it,] Thus the *Seventh General Council*, whoſe whole buſineſs was the ſtating of this Queſtion. And ſee the comparing of the *Honour* given to *Images* with that, to the *Name* of *Jeſus*, in a Synod held at *Mentz*. A. D. 1549. ſince the Reformation, *c.* 41, in the larger Acts of it. † ——*Codicem oculis perluſtrans, cum ad venerabile & tremendum nomen Jeſu devenerit, caput aperit, & ſuſpiciens in cœlum, oculos attollit: & ob id, omni reprehenſione & Idololatria ſuſpicione caret; ſiquidem non literas, &c. ſic honorat; ſed, cogitatione & veneratione mentis ſuæ, ad eum honorandum* [*i. e.* latriâ] *rapitur, cujus memoriam hæ literæ ei ſuggerunt. Cur ergo ſuperſtitionis, aut Idololatria reus peragitur, qui ante Imaginem crucifixi Domini caput aperit, aut procumbens adorat*, &c. And ſee *Vaſquez*, who cites this Synod, thus entitling his, *c.* 11. *Diſp.* 108. in. 3. S. *Thom.* ——*Eodem modo atq; Imagines, nomen Jeſu, & alias res ſacras* (naming, *Crucem, Vaſa ſacra, lib. Evangeliorum*) *eſſe adorandas.* And ſee *Suarez. Diſput.* 54. §. 6. ——*Card. Lugo de Incarnatione. Diſp.* 36. §. 6. ſaying the ſame. I have the rather mentioned here the reverence given at the name of *Jeſus*, becauſe, though that to the *ſacred utenſils*, and *Holy Goſpels* is grown into deſuetude among *Proteſtants*, yet this *other* is ſtill retained.

† *Apud Vaſquez in* 3. *Thom. Diſp.* 108. *c.* 4.

When therefore we ſpeak of that *Superior* Honour [*latria*, or *Dulia*] that is given, or due, to the Exemplar, I mean either the internal honor of the *ſoul*, or alſo external of the *body*, for the *latria*, or *Divine* worſhip conſiſts of both, and herein the external act receives its ſpecification from the internal; and not one, but both theſe, we equally give to our Lord, then alſo, when we pray to him, not-before, or without, an Image; or, if you will, when, in the middle of our prayers, an Image is preſented before us: I ſay, when this *Superior Worſhip* is ſpoken of, though here we uncover our Heads, we kneel [illegible] and embrace it; yet is the *Image* neither *objectum*, nor *Ratio Adorationis*, but only *Adjunctum* (as the Cardinal hath it) *De Imag. l.* 2. *c.* 23. ——*Ipſa Imago nec eſt ſuppoſitum, quod adoratur, nec ratio adorationis, ſed quiddam Adjunctum*, a *Circumſtantial*, an *Inductive*, a Motive, thereof. For the mental intention here wholy directs (as it can at pleaſure) to the *Prototype* theſe outward notes of Honour, ſome of which, (as *kiſsing*, or *embracing*) are accidentally, and concomitantly, applied to the Image. Neither is ſuch external *latrical* worſhip conveighed to the perſon repreſented, either by, or through the *Image*, as a *medium* to it: any way ſo to facilitate, or promote the acceptance thereof, or ingratiate it with the Prototype: But the Image is a meer

§. 323. *n.* 2.

meer *circumstance* of such Adoration, as time, and place are, and any creature of God may be. Yet a *circumstance* very beneficial for reminding us of such duty, as also for rendring this service more fixt and steady; or intense, and devout. This for *worship* due to the *Prototype*.

Next, as for the *inferior relative* Veneration exhibited to their Images: Catholicks do not here pretend, or affirm, any *peculiar presence* of our Lord or his Saints, or any *vertue* either natural, or accessary and derivative, in any such Image, for which it should be worshipped, or honoured; or our *requests* to have any *more access*, or efficacy by, or through, any such Image, upon the Exemplar, or person represented; Or, again, the *Exemplar* any greater *influence* by, or through, it, upon those, who supplicate him before it (these are *Heathen* fancies derided by *Christians*); lastly, pretend no advantage in the use of such Images, either to render our *prayers*, or *worship* more acceptable to our Lord, or his Saints, or more effectual to us, save only, as the retaining of such a grateful memory of our Lord, and his Saints, is conceived a thing well-pleasing to them: And, as the frequent beholding also such representations may excite, and increase our Devotion, Affection, Imitation, *&c.* and these again, performed, obtain a greater reward.

§. 323. n. 3. Things standing thus on the Catholick side, as most certainly they do, I ask, what *certainty*, or *demonstration* can a *Protestant* here produce of any other *error*, or *fault* in the Church; unless he will dispute here against, some *subtile expressions* of some School-men; or some *practice* of *rude* people: The first of which he is neither tyed by the Church to *justifie*; nor the second, to *follow*. In this point, if any *tryal* necessary, it seems to be: Whether the *present Church* continue to teach, what the former hath defin'd? (For which see the late Council of *Trent* referring to that ancient one of Nice; and sufficiently expressed in a very eminent stating of this point) Whether the *practice* of some *ignorant* people in the Church be so faulty, as some would make it? And, if it be; whether the *Church*, teaching otherwise, be chargable with it; or obliged to take away *Images*, for it? Lastly, if here a fault in the Church; Whether a *Subject* of hers, obliged to nothing in this matter unlawful, may, for such her fault, quarrel with her, and *desert* her *Communion*?

† See *Confess. Wirtenberg.*—*Chamier l. 9. c. 8.*—*Confess. Protest. in the Diet at Ausburg.*

§. 324. For the Fourth; *Communion in one kind.* Here, since it is granted by Protestants, * † as also taken for a Principle by Catho-

licks † That *Christ* is wholy and entirely contained, and exhibited in *either* ſpecies taken ſingly, and in every *leaſt Particle* of either ſpecies; Chriſts Body, Blood, Soul, Deity, ſuffering no more ſeparation ſince his Reſurrection; (ſo that none need fear the being deprived of our Lords precious Blood by receiving only the Symbole of his Body) Since this, I ſay, is agreed on, The Queſtion only is; Whether there be any abſolute *Precept* in Scripture commanding, alwaies, to all perſons, the communicating in both kinds. Now Catholicks think this matter, that there is no ſuch *precept*, ſufficiently cleared by the practice of *Antiquity*, and the pureſt times: Which on ſeveral occaſions, gave it in *one kind* only; and this, when there was no caſe of abſolute neceſſity to give it in one kind (but, then, alwaies indeed ſome inconvenience in giving it in; both which is ſtill pretended, when the Church adminiſters it in one.) Now ſuch practice could be in no times lawful, if there were a Divine Precept abſolutely, to all perſons, enjoyning the contrary.

† *Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 21 cap. 3 & Can. 3.*

§. 325.

But if ſuch univerſal precept there be, enjoyning a neceſſary Communion of the Cup, [As; *Drink ye all of this*, Matt. 26. 27. —Or, *Do this in remembrance of me*, Luk. 22. 19.—Or, *Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*, Jo. 6. 53. which is equivalent to this: *Let all thoſe eat my fleſh, and drink my blood, that will have life.*] It ſeems moſt reaſonable. 1. That ſuch Precept be extended to all Communions whatever, as well thoſe private, or domeſtick, as, the publick (ſince in both poſſible to be obſerved) For there occurs nothing in our Lords words diſtinguiſhing theſe Communions, one from another: or ordering a receit of the Cup, in the one, which ſhall be left at liberty in the other: And ſo by ſuch ſence of Scripture, as we have ſaid, the practice of Antiquity is condemned. 2. That it be extended, as to the receiving in *both* kinds, ſo to the receiving them *apart*, and to the drinking of the one, as the eating of the other: For the Scripture is no more expreſs for the receiving of the blood, than it is, for receiving it ſeparated by it ſelf, and for drinking of it: By which the practice of the Eaſtern Churches is condemned, who receive the Symbole of Chriſts *Body* only *intinct* in the *Blood*. 3. Eſpecially, from that text in *c. 6. John* 53. That this *precept* be extended to *all* perſons for whom we expect eternal life: and ſo to Infants. Therefore the communicating of them alſo in both kinds, or one at leaſt, was a cuſtom uſed in Antiquity. Yet ſuch a *neceſſity*, by vertue of any Scripture-precept, *Proteſtants* together with *Catholicks* deny; and both deſiſt from ſuch a practice.

§. 326. Again, ſeveral other Texts we find in Scripture, that may ſeem to have the force of Univerſal Precepts, as much as any concerning communicating in both kinds; As *Act.* 15. 29. for *abſtaining from Blood, and things ſtrangled.* *Luke* 6. 30. — *Of him, that takes away your Goods, ask them not again,* — and; *Give to every one that asketh,* Matt. 6, 17. — *When you faſt, waſh your face, and anoint your head.* c. 5. 34. — *Swear not at all,* Matt. 23 9. — *Call no man your Father on the earth; neither be ye called Maſters* [The Quakers Precepts.] *Salute one another with a kiſs of charity, or an holy kiſs,* frequent in the Apoſtle, *Rom* 16. 16. 1 *Cor.* 16 20. — 2 *Cor.* 13. 12. — 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 26. — *I have given you an example, that ye ſhould do, as I have done to you,* Jo. 13. 14, [for the Clergies waſhing feet before the Communion] — *Do this,* unlimited, in St. *Luke* 22. 19. for any Chriſtian whatever his *breaking bread,* or, *conſecrating,* and diſtributing the communion; — *If any be ſick among you, let him call for the Elders of the Church: and let them pray over him, anointing him with oyl in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith ſhall ſave the ſick, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him up* [not, that every ſick perſon, that the Apoſtles prayed over, ſhould be cured:] *and, if he be in ſins they ſhall be forgiven him, James,* 5. 14, 15. urged as enjoyning extreme unction.

§. 327. Now, notwithſtanding the ſhew of *ſtrict* and *univerſal* Precepts, yet in the underſtanding and practiſing of all theſe, ſave the laſt, *Proteſtants* conform to the judgment of former, and preſent, Church. And in the laſt, though Catholicks think themſelves obliged to receive it, as a Precept; and, accordingly practice; yet Proteſtants deny the one; and forbear the other.

Laſtly, ſome *Proteſtants* there be, and thoſe of note, that deny any peremptory *precept*, or command in Scripture, as in theſe, ſo in thoſe urged for *Communion ſub utraque ſpecie.* — *Ubi jubentur in Scripturis* (ſaith Biſhop *Montague* †) *Infantes baptizari? aut, Canam Domini, ſub utraque ſpecie communicantes, participare? Sexcenta ſunt ejuſmodi, &c. — de quibus poſſumus profiteri: Nil tale docet ſcriptura.* * Biſhop *White* on the Sabbath *p.* 97. — *Genuine Traditions derived from the Apoſtolical times are receiv'd, and honoured by us: Now ſuch are theſe which follow. The hiſtorical Tradition concerning the numbers, and dignity of the Books of Canonical Scripture: The Catholick expoſition of many ſentences of holy Scripture* [Which indeed unleſs received, there will be no conviction or cure of *Hereſies*, and *Schiſmes:*] *Baptiſm of Infants, obſervation of the Lords day: The ſervice of the Church in a known tongue* [the tongues uſed by the Apoſtolical times for God's publick

† *Origin. Eccl. p.* 396.

ſick Service, the Church ſtill continues unchanged:] *The delivering of the Holy Communion to the people in both kinds* [*i. e.* for *publick* communions: For as for *private*, ancient Tradition many times practiſed otherwiſe:] * *Spalatenſ. de Rep. Eccl. l. 5. c. 6. Dico, non eſſe adeo ſub præcepto, ut Euchariſtia & in cibo & in potu ſemper à fidelibus ſumatur, quin ex gravi, ſeu privatâ privatorum cauſâ poſſit, cum fructu & licite, etiam ſub ſolo pane ſumi*, &c. And, indeed, in the *omnes* added to *Bibite*. Matt. 26. it ſeems clear, that our *Lord* had no particular intention, thereby to preſcribe, what *every* Chriſtian was *neceſſarily* to practice; becauſe the *Manducate*, as neceſſary as the *Bibite*, is pronounced without an *omnes*: But, only to ſhew, what he would have to be done at that time by all the other Apoſtles, as well as by him, whom he firſt delivered the Cup to. For whereas ſeveral portions of the bread were ſeverally given to every one of them: Yet the Cup was delivered only to one, from whom it was to be handed ſucceſſively to all the reſt, and divided amongſt them all. Therefore St. *Luke* inſtead of *omnes*, hath, *Take this, and divide it among your ſelves.*

§. 328. In this point then, the main *Triat* ſeems to be: Whether *Antiquity* did, indeed, uſe ſuch a practice, as, on ſeveral occaſions where inconveniences happened of giving it in *both*, to communicate perſons in *one kind* only. Which if found true, it would be too great a temerity and boldneſs in a Proteſtant to alledge *certainty*, or pretend *Demonſtration* of the *ſenſe* of any Text of *Scripture* contrary to that, wherein both the preſent and ancient Church hath underſtood, and interpreted it. Eſpecially (as I ſaid) when theſe they ſtile *Demonſtrations* do not convince others, or, if, notwithſtanding this, they be good and ſufficient Demonſtrations, then muſt they be ſo too for many other Texts named before, as well as for theſe touching communion, to impoſe the ſame ſence, and univerſal preceptive force, on them: Yet, againſt which ſence, Proteſtants are neceſſitated to concur, in their judgment, with Catholicks; nay proceed further to deny ſome to be *Precepts*, which Catholicks accept for ſuch.

§. 329. This Digreſſion from §. 320. I have made, as hoping, it might be beneficial, to ſhew, in ſome *Controverſies* of conſequence, what ſmall Foundation Proteſtants have to pretend *Certainty* and *Demonſtration*, againſt the former Church's Doctrine. To which, in the laſt place, I may add, that ſuch pretence of *Certainty* againſt *Church-Authority* ſuffers a great prejudice from that, which S. *Auſtin* hath obſerved; that it is a plea uſed by all *Hereticks*, —*Hoc faciunt* (ſaith he†) *Hæretici univerſi*, —*vetant credere* [Eccleſiâ proponente] *incognita*; *& certam ſci-* † *Enarrat in Pſal.* 8.

† *De utilitate Cred. c. 1.* *entiam pollicentur.* And he saith, † that he was enticed by the Sect of the *Manichees* on this account, because they promised.—*Se, terribili authoritate separatâ, merâ & simplici ratione* [or, as afterward, magna quadam præsumptione, & pollicitatione, rationum] *eos, qui se audire vellent, introducturos ad Deum, & errore omni liberaturos*: And,—*Se nullum premere ad fidem, nisi prius discussâ & enodatâ veritate.* And again,—† *Eos Catholicam Ecclesiam eo maxime criminari, quod illis, qui ad eam veniunt, præcipitur, ut credant; se autem, non jugum credendi imponere, sed docendi fontem aperire, gloriari.* And therefore he saith in his *Retract. l. 1. c. 14.* That upon this he writ, against this presumption of their's, his Book, *De utilitate Credendi*: Or, *Of the benefit of ones believing Church-Authority.* ~~This from (§. 318.) of the weak Grounds Protestants have of pretending Certainty against Church-Authority.~~ This (from § 318.) That tis no easy matter to arrive at Certainty &c.—

† *Ibid c. 9.*

§. 330. 2. But next, Suppose a person may be infallibly certain of, and can truly demonstrate, something, the contrary of which *Church-Authority* delivers as *certain*, yet if this certainty be only of such a Truth, from the knowledge of which ariseth no great *benefit* to Christians, or to the Church: or at least, not so much benefit, as, weighed in the ballance, will preponderat this other benefit of conserving the Churches peace. Here again these Demonstrators, Protestants also being Judges, are to yield to Church-Authority the obedience of *silence*, and *non-contradiction*: and are to keep such *Truth* to themselves; and not to disturb the publick peace, after any thing defined to the contrary, by divulging it to others.

2. for 1. ~~§. [illegible]~~ vid. p. 278. or § 318.

§. 331. [In vindication of *such obedience*, thus Dr. *Potter*,—‖ *It is true, when the Church hath declared her self in any matter of opinions, or of rites, her Declaration obligeth all her children to peace, and external obedience; nor is it fit or lawful for any private man to oppose his judgment to the publick.* Where he saith also,—*That, by his factiously opposing this his own judgment to the publick, he may become an Heretick in some degree, and* in foro exteriori, *though his opinion were true; and much more, if it be false.* After him Bishop *Bramhal*, thus, †—*That Church* [and much more that person] *which shal, not outwardly acquiesce, after a legal Determination, and cease to disturb Christian unity, though her judgment may be sound, her practice is schismatical.* And, Vindic. of Church of *England*, p. 27.—*When inferior Questions*, (saith he) *not fundamental, are once defined by a lawful General Council, all Christians, though they cannot assent in their judgments, are obliged to passive obedience, to*

† *Schism guarded, p. 2.*

possess

poſſeſs their ſouls in patience; and they, who ſhall oppoſe the Authority, and diſturb the peace of the Church, deſerve to be puniſhed as Hereticks. Doctor *Fern, Diviſion of Churches*, p. 81. requiring conformity of Sectaries to the Church of *England*, argues thus, *If Sectaries ſhall ſay to us: You allow us to uſe our reaſon and judgement in what you teach us: True, ſay we; for your own ſatisfaction: not to abuſe it againſt the Church. But we do not abuſe it, ſay they: but have conſulted our Guides, and uſed all means we can for ſatisfaction. We tell them; You muſt bring evident Scripture, and Demonſtration, againſt publick Authority of the Church: and* [next] *having modeſtly propounded it, attend the judgment thereof.* [But what if, after all, this go againſt them.] *To which, if you cannot aſſent inwardly, yet yield an external peaceable ſubjection, ſo far as the matter queſtioned is capable of it.*] Thus he ſtates the point.

Now, ſuch an external peaceable ſubjection, and obedience (as hath been often ſaid) if it were well obſerved, ſtops all *Reformations* as to theſe points, that are found of leſs conſequence; the Demonſtrators *Truth* muſt die with him. Nor, thus, will any Diſciples be drawn from the *Church*, or their Paſtors, to follow *Strangers*.

§. 232 Next; To know, whether the truth, they are ſo certain of, be alſo of ſo great weight, as that the Churches *peace* and external *unity* is to be broken, rather than ſuch a *Truth* ſtrangled, or loſt; what leſs thing alſo can ſecure them for this, that it is a Truth of much importance, than that, which ſecures them of their certainty, that it is a Truth, namely a *Demonſtration* hereof. Now, the Evidences Proteſtants have brought either of the one, or the other; either, that ſuch Church-Doctrines are *errors*; or, if ſo, errors of great *conſequence*, have been heard and conſidered by Church-Authority: And theſe, by it, neither thought errors intollerable, nor errors at all, But, if Church-Authority may not interpoſe here, and every one may rely on his own particular Judgment, when truths, or errors, are of moment, when not; who is there, when his thoughts are wholy taken up with a thing, and he *totus in illo*, and perhaps, beſides, troubled with an itch, that that knowledge of his, which he eſteems extraordinary, ſhould be communicated, and that *ſe ſcire hoc ſciat alter*, will not thus induce himſelf to think the ſmalleſt matters great? Laſtly, concerning truths of much importance, let this alſo be conſidered: Whether that, which is ſo much pretended by the Reformed, that the Holy Scriptures are clear in all Divine Truths neceſſary, doth not ſtrongly argue againſt them, that none of thoſe things, wherein they gain-ſay the Church, are matters much important,

or

or necessary: Because all these Scriptures, clear in necessaries, will surely be so to the *Church*, as well as to them. As they grant these Scriptures to be *generally*, as to all persons, perspicuous, in all those common points of faith, that are not at all controverted.

3. §. 333. 3. But let this also be allowed: That the error of Church-Authority is not only manifest, but that it both is, and is certainly known to be, in a point most *important* and *necessary*: and that neither the obedience of *assent*, nor yet of *silence*, or non-contradiction, ought to be yielded to Church-Authority therein, yet all this granted will not justifie or secure any in their not yielding a third obedience, meerly *passive*, *viz.* a quiet submission to the Churches *censures*, however deemed in such a particular case unjust: Whereby, if this censure happen to be *Excommunication*, he is patiently to remain so (as who, in such case injoyes still the *internal* communion of the Church, though he want the *external*) till God provide for the vindication of Truth, and his Innocency: But, by no means, to proceed further to set up, or joyn himself to, an external communion *apart* and *separated* from that of his Superiors; and, such a communion as either refuseth any conjunction with them, or at least is prohibited, and excluded, by them; which must alwaies be schismatical, as being that of a *Part* differing from the *Whole*; or, of Inferiors divided from their Canonical Superiors, by which now that Party begins to lose that *internal Communion* of the Church also, which, when unjustly excommunicated, and acquiescing therein, he still enjoyed. Of which persons, thus S. *Austin*, † —*Sæpe finit divina Providentia expelli de congregatione Christianâ etiam bonos viros, quam contumeliam vel injuriam quam cum patientissimè pro ecclesiæ pace, tulerint, neq; ullas novitates, vel schismatis* [*i. e.* segregationis conventiculorum, as he explains it afterward] *vel hæresis, moliti fuerint, docebunt homines, quam vero affectu, & quantâ sinceritate charitatis, Deo serviendum sit.—Hos coronat in occulto Pater, in occulto videns.* And, (*De Baptism. l. 1. c. 17.*) of such persons he saith,—*Ibi magis probantur, quum si intus permaneant* [only with this exception] *Cum adversus ecclesiam nullatenus eriguntur, sed in solidâ unitatis petrâ, fortissimæ charitatis robore, radicantur.* Thus he in the defence of such.

† *De vera Relig. c. 6.*

§. 334. But, If an *unjust* Excommunication should further warrant any to erect Anti-communions; and then, a private person may also pass sentence of such injustice against the Church, who sees not, that this pulls down the whole structure of Church-Government,

ment, and fills it full of ſchiſms; and is the ſame in the Church, as this would be in the Civil State, if a Subject unjuſtly condemned to ſome mulct, or impriſonment, ſhould preſently raiſe, and head an Army againſt the Prince, and with it detain from him ſome part of his Dominions. No man is authorized, by *ſuffering* injuſtice, to *do* it.

§. 335.

See, Chriſtian Reader, how many bars are ſet to keep us within ſuch a degree of ſubjection to the Church, as prevents *Schiſm*. If we are of thoſe, that do not profeſs *certainty* of the contrary to that which the Church teacheth (as the moſt of Chriſtians are ſuch) here *Proteſtants* † agree, that we owe the obedience of *aſſent*, and *ſubmiſſion of judgment* to the ſupremeſt known Church-Authority, that preſides over us. But next, ſuppoſe we pretend certainty of a Truth againſt this Authority; yet, in caſe this truth be not of much concernment, Here Proteſtants || conſent, that we are to yield the obedience of *ſilence*, and *non-contradiction* to it: But, if the Truth be of moment; and ſo ſuppoſed, that neither *ſilence* may be uſed herein; yet are we ſtill tied at leaſt to yield a third ſort of obedience, a *paſſive* one to the Churches *cenſures*, even to that of *Excommunication*, though ſuppoſed unjuſt, without erecting, or reſorting to, any Anti-Communion to that of our Superiors, and of the *whole*; *i. e.* the *Communion Catholick*: And then, whatever degree of obedience a Perſon, well conſidering theſe things, ſhall judge due to be yielded to Church-Authority *in General*, I hope the former Diſcourſe, by clearing the Legality of it, hath juſtly vindicated to the Council of *Trent*. And this Council, once ſubmitted to, infers, as to all the principal modern Controverſies, an univerſal Settlement and Peace. Now the great Paſtor and Biſhop of Souls, in an acceptable time, bring home all thoſe Sheep, that are yet going aſtray, and hearken to the voice of Strangers, into the happy Communion of all his Saints; That there may be *one* Fould, and *one* Shepherd, *unus Dominus, una Fides, unum Corpus*. To Him Allpowerful, and Good, and the conſtant lover of his Spouſe, *the Church*, be given all Glory, and Praiſe, in the ſame his Church, forever. *Amen.*

† See §. 295

|| See §. 331.

1 *Pet.* 2. 25.

Jo. 10. 16. *Eph.* 4. 4. 5.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

Page 8. line 19 *dele*]
9. 2. read *formed*
16. marg. r, *Milevit.*
28. 40. r, *Catholick* 41. r. *National*
36 *marg.* r. §. 34. &c.
37 *marg.* r. §. 37.
38 *marg.* r. §. 38.
39 *marg.* r. § 40.
47 *marg.* r. 667.
79 *marg.* r, n. 102.
86. 23. r. [Trent]
128. 3. r. *would*
136. 20. r. *obstructions*]
137. 6. r. *fifth.*
149. 29. r. *Politician*
153. 25. r. *Olaus.* 26. r. *Upsal.*
160. 23. r. *which was established*
171. 26. r. *Hebrai*
198. 5. r. *testimonialibus, decimam tantum unius aures.*
Ib. 8. r. *Emolumentum ex eisdem ordinum*
200. *marg.* r. *Agathens*
216. 13. r, *so both a*
220. 40. r. *To* [illegible] *see*
221. 6. r. *To* [illegible] §. 164.
239. 9. r. *Rusticks, those*
p. 240. 33. r. *Cerinthus.*
241. 22. r. Caput] *unum*
242. 31. dele *if we are*
245. 40. r. *it is*
246. 31. r. *to divine*
246. 19. r, *schismatis*
249. 34. 34. r. 1st, *That*
251. 4. r. *Terentianum Maurum*
257. *marg.* r- *Bezam.*
258. 1. r. *summi*
259. *marg.* r, *guarded,*
Ib. *marg*, r, *Answ. to*
264. 29 r. *in the*
264. 41. r. *iis me*
265. 23. r. ἐγγραφον, *instar nasi cerei*
265. 26. r. *proferam*
266. 21. r. *consultius*
268. *marg*, dele §. 207, and, §. 297.
Ib. 19. dele *Præstantium virorum Epistolæ,*
273. 32. r. καταλυει
281. 40 r. *Censurer.*
283. marg. *Forbearance.*
284. 42. r. *them? As*
287. 26. r. *or Divine.* l. 32. r. *we kneel before, and embrace, kiss, &c.*
288. 32. r. *and, there, the Churches doctrine.*

The Reader is desired to correct with his pen the *Errata* page] 128—287, line 32—and,---288,